This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06924075 6

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

A

CRITICAL REVIEW

OF THE

ORTHOGRAPHY

OF

DR. WEBSTER'S SERIES OF BOOKS

L934

FOR

SYSTEMATICK INSTRUCTION

IN THE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE;

INCLUDING

HIS FORMER SPELLING-BOOK,

AND THE

ELEMENTARY SPELLING-BOOK, COMPILED BY AARON ELY,

AND PUBLISHED UNDER THE NAME OF NOAH WEBSTER, LL. D.

BY LYMAN COBB.

"Society is directly benefited by the inculcation of truth, and the suppression of errour;" therefore examine.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY COLLINS & HANNAY, 230 PEARL-STREET.
1831.

ADVERTISEMENT.

TO THE PUBLICK.

The importance of a correct and uniform system of orthography is universally admitted, and therefore requires neither argument nor elucidation. This subject has engaged the assiduous attention of the author of the following reviews, for the last twelve years; during which time, he has actually examined, compared, and marked the errours in nearly every publication upon this branch of our language, that has ever appeared either in this country or Great Britain. An important crisis has at last arrived, in relation to our elementary schools and seminaries of learning—a period when it becomes necessary for parents, and the great body of the American community, to decide whether they will continue to follow the systems of orthography and orthoepy hitherto in use, and based upon the analogies of the language, thereby promoting uniformity in the publications of our own and foreign countries; or will adopt a new and contradictory system of innovations, neither warranted by usage nor analogy, and calculated to "*abolish the superstructure, and bring it back to the confusion in orthography, from which Johnson extricated it.*"

It is the peculiar character of the American people, (a character formed from reading and habits of investigation,) to examine before they decide; and, in spreading before the republick of letters in the United States, these criticisms on the publications of Mr. Webster, the author only asks for that liberal indulgence and patient examination to which, from the importance of the subject, he believes them fully entitled.

It has been a primary object with Mr. Webster and his friends, to inculcate the belief, that the author, in publishing his former reviews of Mr. Webster's works, was actuated by personal feelings towards the author of the American Dictionary. The illiberality of this insinuation is only equalled by its want of candour; and, the author feels no reluctance in trusting the question of his motives, his rights, and the correctness and propriety of his strictures, with a nation of impartial and intelligent readers.

To those who are already wedded to the systems of orthography and orthoepy published by Mr. Webster, this publication will be important as an index to the disputable points, and the innovations and contrarieties of the American Lexicographer; and, to such as deem the uniformity and perpetuity of our vernacular language to be paramount to the private interests of an author, it will be useful in enabling them to form a correct estimate of the claims of those publications to the character of Standard Works.

In giving this review to the publick, the author has but one thing to regret; and that is, the necessity of communicating it, in many instances, through the medium of the Post Office, the only means of disseminating it over this widely extended republick. It is confidently believed, however, that a careful perusal will amply remunerate any individual for the trifling expense to which he may thus be subjected.

Respectfully,

THE AUTHOR.

*** It may be necessary to state, that whenever a quotation is given in this review, from the writings of Mr. Webster, his publishers, or his friends, the *original orthography* has been observed.

INTRODUCTION.

THE faculty of speech may be justly considered the leading characteristick that distinguishes man from inferiour animals, places him at the head of animated nature, and stamps him with the seal of immortality. The science of language, therefore, must ever hold a distinguished place in the catalogue of useful knowledge; and, to the labours of those who have devoted their time and talents to the cultivation of our vernacular tongue, the friends of science, and the community at large, are deeply indebted.

There are few classes of literary men from whose labours society has derived more important benefits than from the class of eminent philologists and lexicographers, who, during the last century, have contributed so largely to the cultivation of the English Language; thereby laying the foundation of those highly polished effusions of sentiment for which the writings of the present age are distinguished. The names of Bailey, Ash, Johnson, Sheridan, Walker, Jones, Jameson, and Webster, will ever possess a distinguished niche in the gallery of literary men; and, their contributions to the stock of useful improvements will claim for them the appellation of fathers of English literature. But while I am thus ready and desirous to render to these the just tribute of gratitude for their eminent services in this department of learning, I am by no means disposed to concede the proposition, that their productions are to be exempt from the usual ordeal to which the writings of every other author are subjected, and which is the principal test of relative merit. I mean impartial and candid criticism.

With reference to works designed for elementary instruction, it is particularly important that this right should be admitted and sustained; since errours widely disseminated by these, have an influence more pernicious in itself, and more difficult to be counteracted, than when found in books adapted to mature minds. It has been supposed, however, that this right of examination is not common to every class of citizens—that one at least is and ought to be excluded from this right, though perhaps better qualified from taste, habit, and experience, than most others, for doing justice to the subject. This class comprehends *authors*, *compilers*, and *teachers*.* While in the ordinary affairs of life, we daily resort to mechanical or professional men for their opinions in matters relating peculiarly to their business or profession, as the best evidence for forming a correct judgement, it is not a little surprising, it should for a moment be urged that in matters of science we should not credit the evidence, nay the undeniable facts, produced by an individual who "has had the misfortune" of writing and publishing upon the same subject, and, therefore, *may reasonably be supposed to know something about it.*

I trust I shall be excused for premising thus much in answer to what has already been urged, and will doubtless be reiterated, by Mr. Webster and his friends—that "I am the author of a Spelling-Book and School Dictionary, and am, therefore, incapacitated for doing justice to his literary productions." But

* The Publisher of Webster's Dictionary, in a communication addressed to the Editor of the Boston Courier, and published in that paper, Sept. 28, 1829, makes the following *liberal* appeal to the publick, relative to the criticisms then recently published.

"*Dear Sir*,—Some twenty or thirty days since, I believe, I was looking over a file of your paper, and fell upon a notice of some criticisms on Webster's Dictionary, which have appeared in the Morning Herald, in this city. As I am interested as Publisher of this work, any review which *I* might give of it, would be out of place. But, while I leave others to review the work, it is but justice to the public, as well as to myself, to state the facts concerning these criticisms. They appeared under the signature *Inquirer*. The author is a person by the name of Cobb, *recently a schoolmaster, in one of our western villages, who has had the misfortune to compile a spelling-book and small Dictionary.*"

without attempting to exonerate myself from this imputation, and without further remark relative thereto, I shall assume the right, and leave the result of my examinations to the intelligence and judgement of a discriminating community, to whose unerring decision, whether of condemnation or justification, I shall most cheerfully and readily submit.

Before entering upon the examination of the several works of Mr. Webster, it may not be impertinent to give a succinct chronological history of the causes and circumstances which have contributed to place the adherents of Walker and Webster in opposition to each other; and which have rendered this publication not only justifiable, but indispensable to the promotion of truth, and the protection of individual character and enterprise.

In detailing these, I shall commence at that period, when from experience in the use of Mr. Webster's Spelling-Book and School Dictionary in instructing, I became familiar with the "multitudinous errours," contradictions, and inconsistencies contained in them; and seeing the importance and necessity of a uniform standard, more particularly in orthography, I resolved both to give the result of my investigations to the publick in the way of criticism, and to employ my experience thus acquired, in the compilation of a work for elementary instruction. The former, so far as it relates to the then existing publications of Mr. Webster, was published in a series of numbers in the Albany Argus in 1827–8, and is now re-published in this general review. The result of my labours in the latter, has already been several years before the publick, from whom I have received many flattering evidences of a favourable opinion.

Whether that examination of the former works of Mr. Webster, was either ill-timed or unimportant, is left for others to determine; with this single remark—that it is confidently believed Mr. Webster himself will admit, that if those criticisms had never appeared, the recent compilation of the *Elementary* Spelling-Book would never have been deemed necessary.*

In my examination, I had demonstrated the orthography of Webster to be far less uniform and analogous, than that of Johnson; and Walker's system of pronunciation, which was introduced into this country as early as 1800, had been very generally received, and was already becoming the Standard, in this branch of Philology. Hence it became manifest to the publishers of Webster, that some device must be resorted to, to induce apathy in the publick mind, and thereby procrastinate the inevitable crisis which they foresaw was approaching; the expulsion of his elementary works from our primary schools.

To prevent this, the author of the *American* Spelling-Book was despatched to England, that from "*personal observation*," he might be able to ascertain, or at least on his return to *assert*† that "Walker was wholly unknown," or if known at all, only in the circles of the vulgar: and, it was about the same

* This inference will not be thought unreasonable, notwithstanding the allegation of Mr. Webster in his pamphlet, recently published, (page 9) that the *American* Spelling-Book "is to be suppressed," especially when taken in connexion with the fact, that most of the publishers of his Spelling-Books have reserved to themselves the privilege of publishing either, as shall be found most advantageous to their interests.

† It is truly amusing to observe the arguments advanced by Mr. Webster and his friends, to prove that Walker's Dictionary is *not* the Standard in England. At one time we are told that "*Walker is not known in England*;" at another time, that Mr. Webster "has made a visit to England to ascertain the real state of the language," where he found that "Walker's pronunciation was not used in any *decent* socie y in that country." Again; we are told by Mr. Webster that "Walker's Dictionary is full of inconsistencies from beginning to end; and the attempt to make it a Standard, has done more to corrupt the language than any event which has taken place for five hundred years past. No book is taken as an ultimate Standard in England; and Walker's pronunciation is so erroneous, that no less than *three dictionaries* have been published to correct it; all of them approaching much nearer to actual usage than Walker's."

Let us for a moment examine the *inconsistency* and *deception* in the above statement. First; if Walker be "*not known in England*," how could his pronunciation have so "*corrupted the* language?" Secondly; if Walker's Dictionary be not the Standard in England, why have "three dictionaries been published to correct it?" What evil could arise from the existence of the work, if it were not known or followed?

The fact is, Mr. Webster and his friends know that Walker's Dictionary is popular, and in general use in this country; and, unless they can divert the publick mind from this work, Webster's Dictionary must remain on the shelves of the booksellers. Thus they (Webster and his friends) endeavour to convince the *Americans* people that Jameson, a later writer than Walker, is more correct, because, forsooth, his work is not known, or in use in this *country! But Jameson's Dictionary*, which was "published to *correct* Walker's," (as stated by Mr. Webster,) contains *twice as many contradictions* and *inconsistencies* as Walker's; and I challenge Mr. Webster or his friends *to show that this statement is untrue.*

time announced in the journals of the day, that Mr. Webster would soon publish a Dictionary that would contain a specifick for all the deficiencies, discrepances, and anomalies, not only in the former works of Mr. Webster, but of all other authors, and would form an *unvarying* STANDARD of the orthography and orthoepy of the English language. Nor was this all that was fondly anticipated from the promised labours of the American Philologist. A new series of Elementary Works for the use of schools was immediately to emanate from this immutable Standard, which should be divested of the inaccuracies, contradictions, and absurdities of *Johnson*, *Walker*, *Jameson*, and others—publications which should correspond in their orthography and pronunciation with the Standard and with one another, and thereby produce what is universally admitted to be a desideratum—uniformity in this department of Philology.

In order more emphatically to forestall publick opinion in relation to this forthcoming work, the friends of Mr. Webster re-published in this city under the title of Red Book, (originally an English publication,) Beardroft's Practical Orthography; in which the unpublished Quarto Dictionary of Mr. Webster was lauded with fulsome and extravagant praise, although the panegyrist admitted "that he had seen only the introductory part of the work."*

The effect of these measures was such as might naturally be expected. All further competition and investigation were for a time arrested, while his friends waited with sanguine confidence the appearance of the promised Standard. The literary qualifications of its author became generally admitted—the works of the great English lexicographers, with their "palpable inconsistencies and preposterous anomalies," were spread before him; a long and liberal patronage had relieved him from those pecuniary embarrassments,† which he had attributed to Johnson as a prolifick source of errour; and the favourable opinion every where entertained of his judgement and experience combined to secure a general acquiescence in the belief, that all these important considerations would be realized in the Quarto Dictionary. Added to these, the influence of an extensive, aristocratical, and persevering class of booksellers, whose interests were already to a large amount identified with the success of Mr. Webster, and whose sensibility and vigilance were graduated by the amount of capital they had invested in his works, all contributed to usher the quarto before the community under the most favourable auspices. It is now about three years since it was published. It has become the property of the community so far as its claims to a Standard work are concerned; and though the most unwearied pains have been taken by Mr. Webster and his friends to puff it in newspapers and periodicals, though by lecturing in every city and village, and by personally applying to Members of Congress and others, he has been able to procure the recommendations of many men, eminent for their literature, in different parts of the United States, yet I shall, in the following pages, show, beyond

* I should not now condescend to notice this ephemeral production of the Websterian school, did I not feel it my duty to bestow a passing remark upon the unfounded and illiberal charges contained in that work, that the dictionaries of Johnson and Walker are more erroneous than those of Webster—a statement equally unjust and untrue, as I shall abundantly prove hereafter. It is not unworthy of remark, that at the very time this same Red Book was thus lending its aid and influence to blacken the fame of the illustrious dead, and to pave the way for the innovations of Mr. Webster, the American editor of that work expressed to me his entire want of confidence in the qualifications of Mr. Webster as a lexicographer, and his anxious forebodings that the expected publication would disappoint his friends. I was at that time engaged in writing the review of Mr. Webster's old Spelling-Book, before alluded to, and at the request of the editor of the Red Book, furnished him with a "*marked copy of Mr. Webster's Spelling-Book*," which, by some means, found its way to Mr. Webster's library, as he subsequently admitted; but whether, by this means, Mr. Webster profited from my labours, it is not now important to inquire.

† Mr. Webster, in the preface prefixed to his dictionary, published in 1806, page 19, when speaking of Dr. Johnson, stated, that "to assign the causes of these defects, is by no means difficult. We are told in the accounts of Johnson's life, that he was almost always depressed by disease and poverty: that he was naturally indolent, and seldom wrote until he was urged by want, or the necessity of fulfilling his engagements with his bookseller. Hence it happened, that he often received the money for his writings before his manuscripts were prepared. Then, when called upon for copy, he was compelled to prepare his manuscripts in haste; and it may be reasonably supposed, that, in some instances, they were sent to the press in an unfinished state. These facts, while they may account for, by no means excuse the multitude of errors in his dictionary."

the possibility of contradiction, and, I trust, in the spirit of candid and liberal criticism, that it is, in its orthography, far less accurate than the Dictionaries of Johnson and Walker, and in this respect less entitled to the character of a Standard work.

Shortly after the publication of the quarto, Mr. Webster made an effort to redeem the pledge given by his friends relative to the series of class-books for systematick instruction, and for that purpose employed Mr. Aaron Ely of this city to compile the *Elementary* Spelling-Book.* Uniformity in orthography, it must not be forgotten, was the important quality which this series of books was to possess over all others; and it was, therefore, reasonable to expect that the first of the series would correspond with the quarto, especially in all those words whose orthography Mr. Webster claimed to have improved and rendered consistent with analogy. With what degree of fidelity this pledge has been redeemed, the community will be enabled to judge from the fact, that the compiler (Mr. Ely) has thought it prudent to omit many of those words, the orthography of which Mr. Webster has changed; and in other cases, he has followed the orthography of Johnson in opposition to that of Webster.

It is not a little surprising that, notwithstanding the repeated asseverations of Mr. Webster and his friends, both before the publication of the quarto, and while the *Elementary* Spelling-Book was being prepared for the press, that "WALKER'S DICTIONARY WAS UNKNOWN IN ENGLAND," Mr. Ely was wont to claim as a matter of merit for that compilation, that it was made from Walker's Rhyming Dictionary, and that it was from that work he derived the system of classification by the terminations. It is not less a matter of surprise, that the publisher of the Octavo, while he endeavours to create the belief that this illustrious author is unknown, or is disrespected in his native country, has the matchless effrontery to insert at length in that edition, "WALKER'S KEY TO THE CLASSICAL PRONUNCIATION OF GREEK, LATIN, AND SCRIPTURE PROPER NAMES."

The last effort of the great American Lexicographer is the Duodecimo Dictionary, designed as the codicil to his other publications, and contains, as he alleges, "the pointing, orthography, and pronunciation which he most approves." Now, should it turn out, that this publication is at variance with the STANDARD, (to wit, the *quarto*,) with the *octavo*, and with the *Elementary* Spelling-Book, it must be conceded, that either the works of his meridian thought, or those of his dotage, are not entitled to confidence. This inconsistency I unhesitatingly declare to be the fact, and pledge myself to prove it in the following examination.

I regret, in closing this Introduction, the necessity of animadverting upon the malevolent and unwarrantable aspersions in which Mr. Webster has thought proper to indulge, in a pamphlet recently published by him, containing the recommendations to his Series of Books, accusing others of plagiarism, and stigmatizing them with the appellation of "PEDDLING COMPILERS," when it is notorious that for the last three years, he has been making tours through the country, and by appeals to the sympathies of individuals, has succeeded in procuring for his works an introduction to which their comparative merits would never have entitled them. The propriety of such a course for proselyting, and for procuring the names of individuals, as recommendatory, whose opportunity and business totally disqualify them for giving an opinion founded upon knowledge, may reasonably be questioned,† a course which it is humbly conceived would never be resorted to, where personal feelings had not usurped the reins of reason and candour.

New York, October 10, 1831. LYMAN COBB.

* The following extract is taken from the communication published in the New York Commercial Advertiser, Dec. 15, 1829, by Mr. Joseph McKeen, who was Secretary of the meeting of the teachers in this city, when the report in favour of Mr. Webster's Elementary Spelling-Book was *rejected* by a large majority.

"That Mr. Ely was engaged to perform this service for Dr. Webster at the compensation of 1000 dollars, I could say on the authority of E. W. Morse and A. M. Merchant, two gentlemen whose veracity will not be questioned in this community, both of them warm friends of Dr. Webster. I had also the evidence of Mr. Ely himself, that he did so compile the book; and, that for convenience in finding words of similar terminations, he had used Walker's Rhyming Dictionary, a London edition of 1824; that he sent the manuscript sheets on to Dr. Webster at New Haven, and that Dr. Webster was pleased with the execution of the work, and had written him a complimentary letter. Mr. Ely was a sedate and religious man, and could have had no apparent object in misrepresentation."

† The following editorial article, which appeared in the New York Evening Post of April 12, 1831, so fully corresponds with my views upon this subject, that I have taken the liberty of inserting it here.

"We find in the Washington Telegraph, a certificate of more than one hundred members of Congress to the merits of Webster's Dictionary, recommending it as a work proper to be consulted as a standard of the language.

"Without meaning any disrespect to the gentlemen who have subscribed this certificate, we must say that we do not think it will do the Dictionary any good. We suffer members of Congress to make our laws, but not to make our language. It is their province to adjust the duties on salt and molasses, but not the accents on words; to give currency to coins, but not to vocables. The English language is theirs, to handle as they please in their speeches in Congress and addresses to their friends at home—a liberty which some of them push to its farthest limits; but it is not for them to dictate to their constituents in what manner they shall use it. Among the names subscribed to the certificate in the Telegraph, there may be some three or four gentlemen whose opinion on the subject deserves respect, as the opinion of men who have studied our language critically; but as to the list in general, it is no more entitled to attention for its authority in a matter of literature, than one that would be obtained by going from this office through Pine street to Broadway, and calling at the doors on each side. In making these remarks, we express no opinion on the subject of the dictionary. If destined to make its way as a book of authority, it must be supported by the suffrages of men deeply versed in the language, who have given the work an attentive examination—a task of no slight labour, requiring a great deal of leisure."

REVIEW

OF

WEBSTER'S QUARTO DICTIONARY.

THE most prominent innovation in the orthography of Mr. Webster's Dictionary, is the omission of *k* in the numerous class of words which end in *ck* in Johnson's Dictionary. This innovation is considered by Mr. Webster a great *improvement* on the score of *uniformity*.

Of this class of words, there are in our language (acknowledged by Mr. Webster in his dictionaries) about *five hundred:* of these, Mr. Webster has terminated about *three hundred and twenty* with C *only;* and about *one hundred and eighty* with the C and K both! quite a "*uniformity*" indeed! Yet he has stated, that "Johnson's orthography, which some compilers follow, has been, in several classes of words, *corrected* by modern writers; as by the omission of *u* in *error, candor, superior;* and *k* in *public, music*, &c. I have extended this *correction* to ALL the words of these classes, with a view to UNIFORMITY; and have *corrected a few other palpable errors in the common orthography!*" The candid reader can judge whether he has that "*uniformity.*"

I will now offer some remarks as to the *propriety* or impropriety of this *innovation*, in omitting *k* in this class of words. If we refer to the languages from which these words were derived, we shall find a very great *variety* of terminations, entirely void of *uniformity*, as *c, ck, cke, cus, que, cen, cken, cean, cca, ca, cian, cee*, &c.; so that every person will, it is presumed, perceive the necessity of uniformity in this class of words in our language, and conclude that *all* should end with *c* only, or *all* with *ck;* as the *pronunciation* of the syllable would be the same in either case. I will also attempt to point out the difficulties which would result, should this class of words end with *c* only, as blac, loc, attac, frolic, mimic, pnysic, &c.; or should the *c* (being a redundant letter in the language, or merely a representative, and consequently in this termination *ck*) be omitted, and the words end with *k* only, as blak, lok, pak, attak, &c. First; it has been observed that the pronunciation of the syllables would be the same, whether the words should end with *ck* or with *c* only; but as we form derivatives from them by adding *ing, ed*, or *er*, the *c* would be pronounced like *s* in these derivatives, agreeably to the invariable rule in the language, of pronouncing *c* like *s* before *e, i*, and *y;* (and without which distinct rule, the pronunciation of *c* in our language could never be learned, as it is used indiscriminately before *a, o*, and *u*, and *e, i*, and *y;*) so that the sound of the primitive syllable, or word, would be lost in the derivative; as back, bac, bac-ing, bac-ed, pronounced bak, bas-ing, bas-ed; attack, attac, attac-ing, attac-ed, pronounced attas-ing, attas-ed; frolic, frolic-ing, frolic-ed, pronounced frolis-ing, frolis-ed; physic, physic-ing, physic-ed, pronounced physis-ing, physis-ed, &c. &c.; for if the *k* be not in the primitive, we may not insert it in the derivative, any more than we may *x* or *z*, agreeably to any rule of spelling derivatives. Secondly; if *c* (the redundant letter in this termination) should be omitted in the primitive words, we must double the *k* in forming the derivatives from the words of this class, of one syllable, or those accented on the last syllable, agreeably to the established rule of the language, in forming derivative words, which is, that a consonant which ends a monosyllable or a word accented on the last syllable, preceded by a single vowel, should be doubled, when a syllable is added beginning with a vowel; as rob, robbing, robbed, debar, debarring, debarred, &c.; consequently thus, back, bak, bakking, bakked; black, blakker, blakken, blakking, blakked; attack, attak, attakking, attakked, &c., which would appear very awkward, as *kk* are not in English, and it would also be more difficult to write *kk* than *ck*. Hence it appears evident that the "uniformity" of which Mr. Webster speaks so highly, should consist in spelling all these words with *ck* in the primitives, and that great difficulty and perplexity would result from any other "uniformity" in the orthography of this numerous class of words. The *k* should end all these words, and should be retained in all derivatives, except when the *k* is followed by *a, o*, or *u*, (unless the *c* be sounded like *s* in the derivative;) as mimick, mimicking, mimicked, physick, physicking, physicked, frolick, frolicking, frolicked, lucky, &c.; but not in physical, publication, &c., as the *c* comes before *a*, and is hard like *k*, the *k* need not be retained. Mr. Webster must have lost sight of this rule, and the above reasons, or else he is *wilful* respecting them, or he would not, in speaking of this class of words, have stated in his introduction, that "to add *k* after *c* in such words (speaking of musick, publick, and republican, &c.) is beyond measure absurd, for both have the same power, having been formed from the same original character," and that "they never proceeded so far as to carry the absurdity through the derivatives; never writing publickation, musickal, rhetorickal." Yet Mr. Webster has carried the "*absurdity*" so far as to spell *trafficable* with k, in which it should have been omitted.

for the same reason that *k* is omitted in *publication*, viz. the *a* follows *ck*, and consequently the *c* is hard as in the primitive without *k*!

Let us farther examine Mr. Webster's orthography of this class of words for the purpose of ascertaining whether he has that "uniformity" which "is a prime excellence in the rules of language," or whether he is one of that class of "modern" writers who "fortunately, have rejected *k* from words in which it is useless." And first; with regard to *uniformity* in the orthography of these words. I have already stated that he HAS RETAINED the *k* in about *one hundred and eighty* of the *five hundred* words of this class, so that no person will "contend" that he *has* that "*uniformity*"! Secondly; with regard to Mr. Webster's rejection of *k* "from words in which it is *useless*." As Mr. Webster has spoken in such strong terms of the "prime excellence" of "uniformity," we might *reasonably* suppose that he would have *retained k* in *all* these words, or would have omitted it in *all*, from which we never form derivatives; yet he has not in the *retention* of *k* in the one hundred and eighty words, or in the *expulsion* of it in the three hundred and twenty, paid any regard to these principles: for instance; he has *retained k* in many words in which it is followed by *e* or *i* in forming derivatives, as lock, stock, attack, traffick, frolick, ransack, &c.; and he has *omitted* it in words of the *same* class! as physic, and garlic, without *k*, from which physicking, physicked, and garlickeater, are formed. He has spelled garliceater without *k*, which must, agreeably to his "directions for the pronunciation of words," be pronounced garliseater, as he says, "before *e*, *c* is precisely equivalent to *s*." Under the word unphysicked he has spelled physicked with *k*, though he has not *k* in physic! Mr. Webster has spelled mimic, when a noun, without *k*, and with it when a verb; yet he has made no such distinction in the words frolick and traffick, having spelled them with *k* in both cases! and he has spelled these three words in this *contradictory* manner in the definitions of the same words! This *innovation* makes another "anomaly" in our language, that of *spelling* the noun and verb differently, when they are *pronounced* alike. Again, he has *retained k* in many words from which no derivatives are formed; as almanack, bailiwick, barrack, bassock, bullock, buttock, frock, girrock, haddock, hattock, hemlock, hillock, hollyhock, jannock, linstock, mattock, paddock, pollock, peacock, puddock, shamrock, &c.; and he has *omitted* the *k* in words of the *same* class! as bishopric, candoc, carac, cammoc, cambric, hammoc, hommoc, hassoc, limbec, puttoc, tussoc, &c.

Again; he has *inserted k* after *c* in some derivatives, in which *c* is followed by a consonant; as frolickly, frolicksome, frolicksomeness, trackless, &c.; and has *omitted* it in others of the *same* class! as franticness, mimicry, publicly, publicness, &c.!

And again; he has also *inserted k* after *c* in some compound words, as almanack-maker, barrack-master, &c. and has *omitted* the *k* in other words of the *same* class! as panic-grass, public-spirited, &c.!

Thus Mr. Webster, instead of a "*uniformity*" in the orthography of these words, has spelled them in such a manner as to produce every species of *contradiction* and *inconsistency* imaginable, and very great defect and perplexity in the formation of many derivatives; yet Johnson and Walker, whom Mr. Webster has so strongly *censured* for their retaining the *k*, have by the retention of the *k* in *all* this class of words, observed a system of orthography which is *uniform* and *consistent*, and avoids the *defect* and *perplexity* which would result in the formation of derivatives, should the *k* be omitted. It is quite surprising that Mr. Webster should have condemned Johnson and Walker's retention of *k*, and of not observing uniformity, when they are *uniform* and *consistent* in these words, and *he* has not observed either *uniformity* or *consistency* in any one particular!! In this retention of *k*, Johnson and Walker are supported by the following lexicographers, viz. Bailey, Sheridan, Perry, (original, not *American* editions) Jones, Jameson, (published in London 1827,) Allison, and Todd's Johnson (published in Boston 1828,) edited by *J. E. Worcester*. This *omission* of *k* in some words is said to be a great *improvement*, and it is made the subject of every newspaper article written by Mr. Webster or his friends, and is particularly dwelt on by him in his lectures and speeches, in favour of his system, in opposition to Johnson and Walker. But it is utterly impossible for any person to adopt all the *contradictions* and *inconsistencies* which Mr. Webster has in the orthography of this class of words, as has been fully shown, it is believed. It is the practice with many writers, editors, and printers, to omit the *k* in some of these words, and retain it in others, without any apparent regard to uniformity; but it is presumed that no person, after having thoroughly examined the principles of our language, will pursue this system of spelling (merely for the sake of convenience) which is void of consistency and uniformity, and produces perplexity in the formation of many derivatives.

The second innovation in Mr. Webster's orthography, claimed as a great *improvement*, is the omission of *u* in the unaccented termination *our*, as labour, honour, vigour, inferiour, &c. The "reasons" assigned in support of this omission of *u*, contrary to our most approved English lexicographers, are, that "there is inconvenience, if not impropriety, in writing labour with *u*, but laborious without it: as also rigour, but rigorous; vigour, invigorate; inferiour, inferiority, &c. We deem it most correct and most convenient, to restore the original Latin orthography." To me, the above "reasons" seem to be not well founded; for, reasoning from the same analogy, we might condemn the "impropriety" of inserting

u in curious, generous, pompous, &c. when it is not in curiosity, generosity, pomposity, &c.; *i* in declaim, exclaim, explain, proclaim, repair, villain, grain, &c. but not in declamation, exclamation, explanation, proclamation, reparation, villany, granary, &c., also the "impropriety" of inserting *a* in congeal, reveal, &c., but not in congelation, revelation, &c. &c., in all of which, and in numerous others of similar analogy, Mr. Webster has inserted letters in one word (the primitive) which are not in the other (the derivative,) precisely as Johnson, Walker, and *all* other lexicographers have. In fact, there are numerous letters in our language, many of which are necessary in the primitive words, others are unnecessary; as final *e* in waste, name, hate, fertile, servile, &c.; final *n* in autumn, condemn, &c.; *u* in labour, rigour, generous, &c. Of these many are useless in forming the derivative words, as *e* in wasting, hating, fertility, servility, &c.; *u* in laborious, rigorous, generosity, &c.; and others are necessary, as *n* in autumnal, condemnation, &c. Again; many words are spelled differently from others of a like or similar pronunciation, by the use of a different letter which shall be made to convey the same sound by common consent, or by the retention of silent letters in many words which shall distinguish one word from another, both to the reader and hearer; as rein, reign, rain; bot, boat, bought; men, mean, mien; the, thee, they; rite, right, write, wright; past, paste; revel, reveal; morning, mourning; pus, puss; man, main; wet, weight; bran, brain, brawn, &c. &c. Hundreds of other letters might have been expunged by Mr. Webster with as much and even more propriety than the *k* and *u* in the two preceding classes of words; for, these are the most objectionable classes which could possibly have been selected by him, as he has not, and could not, render them either *uniform* or *consistent*. Again, Mr. Webster has stated that "this orthography (the retention of *ou*) is not calculated to exhibit the English pronunciation." In the preceding declaration Mr. Webster was under a great *mistake;* for this unaccented *ou* is pronounced like *u* short, consequently when the *u* is retained (as it should be) the *o* is silent and the *u* is sounded short, as in the original, agreeably to the rule of pronouncing this unaccented diphthong *ou* (and other diphthongs unaccented, which is, that the first vowel should be silent, and the latter sounded, as *ui* in biscuit, *ei* in foreign, *ai* in bargain, &c. &c.) in all the terminations *ous* and *our*. This principle is acknowledged by Mr. Webster in *his* Spelling-Book, in which he has *o* italick in the termination *ous*, and *u* Roman, as pious, grievous, &c. and in the word behaviour! which pointedly *contradicts* his statement above; viz. that the retention of the *u* "is not calculated to exhibit the English pronunciation." Hence if Mr. Webster wished to make an *innovation* which would be an *improvement*, he should have omitted the *o* and retained the *u;* but he has retained the *o* which should be omitted, (if either,) and is silent [see the words behaviour, page 91; heinous, pious, p. 46; glorious, previous, p. 59; in *his* Spelling-Book,] and which must have the sound of the *u* (short) which he expunged! and he has expunged the *u* which was sounded! In his expulsion of *u* in this unaccented *ou*, we find the same *consistency* and *uniformity* which characterize his expulsion of *k* in the termination *ck*, as he has *omitted* the *u* in about *fifty* words ending in *our*, and has retained it in the *same* unaccented diphthong in about *six hundred* words ending in *ous!* The *u* in this unaccented termination *our*, is retained in this class of words by those lexicographers who spell the words which end in *ck* uniformly, viz. Bailey, Sheridan, Perry, Jones, Jameson, Todd's Johnson, &c.

The third innovation in Mr. Webster's orthography, which he claims to be a very *particular improvement*, is the termination of the class of words which end in *re* in *all* other dictionaries. In the orthography of this class of words, in which the termination *re* is preceded by a consonant, Mr. Webster has made a number of variations, and has many *contradictions* and *inconsistencies*. He has spelled accouter, amphitheater, center, concenter, fiber, luster, maneuver, meter, miter, ocher, scepter, sepulcher, specter, and verteber, with *er* only! and he has spelled omber and ombre, saltpeter and saltpetre, peter and petre, theater and theatre, saber and sabre, *both* ways, with *er* and *re!*

Again; he has spelled belleslettres, chancre, electre, livre, and lucre, with *re* only! He has also spelled acre with *re*, and aker with *er!* and has given aker the preference, as "the most correct orthography," yet he has written it *acre* in the definition of *rood!* He has spelled massacer and massacre, with *er* and *re!* and, although he has placed massacer first, yet he has given massa*cre* in the definition of the word itself! Thus we find *inconsistency* and a want of *uniformity* in the orthography of *this* class of words, having all *contradictions* possible, as he has spelled part of them with *er*, or *re* only, and part of them with *er* and *re* both! one with *cer*, and one with *ker!* It is indeed surprising, that Mr. Webster has spelled these words in such a *contradictory* manner. Why he has spelled acre, aker, with *ker*, and not lucre and chancre, luker and chanker, with *ker* also, when all of them end in *cre;* and farther, why he has spelled massacer, *cer*, aker, *ker*, when these four end in *cre*, can not be easily seen! Great perplexity would arise in the formation of derivatives from words of this class should they end in *er;* but when they end in *re*, we drop the final *e*, when we form derivatives by adding a syllable or a part of a syllable, as we do in forming derivatives from other words which end in *e*, and thereby render them regular in their formation; thus centre, centrick; fibre, fibrous; lustre, lustrous; nitre, nitrous; sepulchre, sepulchral, *&c.; but they must* be formed in a very awkward manner when these words end in *er, as center, centrick; luster*, lustrous; sepulcher, sepulchral, &c. Mr. Webster has, whe

speaking of this class of words in his introduction, observed, that "in the present instances want of *uniformity* is not the only evil. The present orthography has introduced an awkward mode of writing the derivatives, for example, centred, sceptred, sepulchred." Yet he has himself "introduced" this "awkward mode of spelling derivatives" in the word *acred*, which he has spelled *cred*; and agreeably to analogy, he must spell massacred, *cred*, unless he shall adopt his new orthography of massacer, in which case it would be pronounced massasered! as "*c*, before *e*, is precisely equivalent to *s*." The *r* is transposed in the pronunciation of the word acred (as he has spelled it) as it is, and should be, in centred, sceptred, &c., and so the words should be spelled. The same *inconsistency* which he has fallen into in spelling acred and massacred, *red*; and centered and sceptered, *cred*, we shall find in other derivatives formed from words in this class; thus chancre, chancrous; and niter, nitrous, *ous*; and ocher, ocherous, *erous!* But if these words be spelled with *re*, no perplexity or inconsistency will then exist in the formation of derivatives.

Johnson and Walker, and the other lexicographers above referred to, retain the *re* in these words, and are *consistent* and *uniform*, whereas, from the preceding exposition, it will appear that Mr. Webster is not.

I have taken notice of three prominent "innovations" in the orthography of three different classes of words, in the AMERICAN DICTIONARY, viz. words which end in *ck*, in unaccented *our*, and in *re*. These "innovations" were adopted by Mr. Webster in his former dictionaries, and in his Spelling-Book, although at variance with Johnson, Walker, &c. as it has been shown.

I will now take notice of some of his *new* "innovations," and show that the same *inconsistency* and want of *uniformity* exist in their orthography as in the classes of which notice has been taken.

Of the class of words which end in *ff*, (not monosyllables,) Mr. Webster has spelled many with *ff*, and others with single *f*; as bailif, caitif, dandruf, mastif, plaintif, pontif, restif, sherif, and tarif, with single *f*; distaff, hippogriff, and midriff, with *ff!* Bailiff, caitiff, dandruff, and mastiff, are spelled with *ff* in the text, but he has *corrected* them in his "corrections" at the close of his dictionary, by spelling them with single *f!* Thus he has *nine* with single *f*, and *three* with *ff!* He has spelled bailif with single *f* in his "corrections," but he has spelled boundbailiff and bumbailiff with *ff*, and in the definition of bumbailiff he has also used underbailiff with *ff!* He has spelled pontif with single *f*, and archpontiff with *ff*; and in the definition of archpontiff, he has spelled pontiff with *ff!* but in the definition of pontif he has spelled it with single *f!* He has spelled deputysheriff with *ff*, and undersherif with single *f*; and in defining deputysheriff he has sheriff with *ff*, but in defining undersherif he has sherif with single *f!* In his "corrections" he has spelled *chif* with single *f*, but in his text he has all of the other monosyllables of this class with *ff*, as cuff, buff, puff, skiff, &c.

Thus we see that Mr. Webster is extremely *inconsistent* and *contradictory* in the orthography of this class of words. Johnson, Walker, Todd, Jameson, &c. &c. have spelled *all* of these words with *ff*, and have preserved *consistency* and *uniformity*; and even Mr. Webster himself spelled all these words with *ff* in his two *former* dictionaries, published in 1806 and 1817. It is the custom in our language to write *ff* and *ss* in many cases where all other consonants would be single, particularly in unaccented terminations, as bailiff, sheriff, &c. harass, compass, &c. If Mr. Webster would be *consistent*, he should omit one *s* in the words harass, embarrass, compass, &c. &c. as *ss* is as "unnecessary" in the words of this class, as *ff* is in the class of words in which he has expunged an *f!* But he seems not to have taken *consistency* into the account at all in making his innovations.

In speaking of the class of words which end in *ence* or *ense*, Mr. Webster has observed, that "defense, expense, offense, pretense, recompense, should be spelled with *s*, for this letter must be used in the derivatives, defensive, expensive, pretension, recompensing. Uniformity is here a great convenience." But has Mr. Webster by this change of *c* to *s*, in two or three words, produced "uniformity" throughout the language? He has retained *c* in fence, trance, &c. so that the same "anomalies" appear in his, as in other dictionaries. Thus fence, trance, fenceless, fencible, tranced, &c., with *c*; and offenseless, defensible, entransed, &c., with *s!* If he intended to produce "uniformity," he should have spelled all these words with *c* or *s* only. Again; he has spelled entranse (when a verb) with *s*, but he has spelled disentrance with *c*, and he has spelled the derivatives of each in this *contradictory* manner, as entransing, entransed, with *s*, and disentrancing, disentranced, with *c!* He has also, in defining the word entranse, spelled transe with *s*, but in defining disentrance, he has spelled trance with *c!* Thus every possible *contradiction* and want of "uniformity" in *this* class of words also.

In the orthography of the word *ache* and its compounds and derivatives, Mr. Webster has a number of "anomalies and innovations" which are void of *consistency* and *uniformity*; for instance, he has spelled *ache* and *ake*, with *ch* and *k*, and has given *ake* the preference; but in all the compounds he has *ch*, as bellyache, boneache, headach, heartach, and toothache! He has spelled aching and aking, with *ch* and *k*, without giving a preference, but he has *spelled aching but one way, with k* only! He has, in defining *ake*, spelled toothake and *headake with k, but in the text has* spelled them toothache and headach, with *ch*! He has

spelled bellyache, boneache, and toothache, with final *e*, and headach and heartach without it! He has spelled headach, in the text, without final *e*, and with it in the definition of the word *angor!* Thus he has spelled headach three different ways! In this list of words, *seven* in number, Mr. Webster has *five contradictions* and *inconsistencies!*

The next "innovations" in the orthography of this work, of which I shall take notice, are those in the words which usually end in *l* or *ll*.

Mr. Webster has observed, that befall, install, recall, foretell, distill, fulfill, &c., should end with *ll*. The "*reasons*" given are, that "the orthography, befal, recal, instal, (single *l*,) leads to a false pronunciation. This is not the case with foretel, &c., but in all such words, the last consonant *must* be doubled in the derivation, foretelling, distillery, distiller, and a *rule* is more convenient than a *rule* and an *exception*."

The foregoing "reason" in favour of ending foretell, distill, fulfill, &c., with *ll*, instead of single *l*, viz. "that the last consonant *must* be doubled in the derivation, foreteller, distiller," &c., is very *novel* and *singular*, and seems not to be supported either by *analogy* or *custom;* for unless *l* be a *privileged* letter, there can be no better "reason" given in support of doubling *that* letter in distill, extill, &c., than in favour of doubling *r* in debar, *n* in trepan, *t* in admit, &c. &c., because the *r*, *n*, and *t* "*must* be doubled in the derivation," debarring, trepanning, admitting, &c.; and Mr. Webster's practice is far from acknowledging *l* as a *privileged* letter, as he has not given it so much privilege as other lexicographers have, for he has spelled counselor, traveler, &c., with *single l* instead of *ll*, as all others have spelled them. Although the preceding "reasons" are given as conclusive arguments in favour of doubling final *l* in these words, yet we find the same *inconsistencies* and *contradictions* in the orthography of this class of words, which characterize the other "innovations" and *intended* "improvements" in the orthography of the language, of which notice has been taken. Thus he has spelled distill, extill, foretell, instill, with *ll*, and compel, dispel, expel, excel, impel, propel, rebel, (verb,) refel, repel, with single *ll* and the *l* is doubled, and "must be in the derivations" of *all* these words alike! Again; Mr. Webster has annul, disannul, with single *l*, contrary to the "reasons" above given, as the *l* "must be doubled in the derivations," annulling, annulled, disannulling, &c.; and he can not assign this as a "reason," that the *u* would be sounded as in *bull*, should the *l* be doubled, as *u* never has that sound when preceded by *n!* the orthography of these words then is a *contradiction* of his rule. Thus he has the following, with numerous other similar *inconsistencies:* annulment, disannulment, &c., with single *l*, and distillment, fulfillment, &c., with *ll!* He has spelled control, parol, bandrol, with single *l*, and enroll, disenroll, patroll, unroll, with *ll!* Thus we find the following *inconsistencies:* controlment with single *l*, and enrollment with *ll!* Johnson, Walker, Jameson, &c., have spelled these last three classes of words with single *l*, in the orthography of which they are *consistent* and *uniform*.

It is the custom with *all* lexicographers (except Mr. Webster) to omit one *l* in the derivatives and compounds of fill, full, skill, will, &c., thus fulness, sinfulness, skilful, wilful, skilfulness, &c.; but Mr. Webster has spelled fullness, skillful, willful, &c. with *ll*, though he has single *l*, in the last syllable of skillful, willful, &c. He cannot, with any degree of propriety, assert that *ll* are inserted in fullness, &c. to denote the sound of *u*, as the *u* has the *same* sound in fulfill, skillful, skillfulness, spoonful, handful, &c. in which it is followed by single *ll!* Hence we observe that there is neither *propriety* nor *consistency* in this doubling of *l* by Mr. Webster in the compounds, above referred to, contrary to the established rules of the language, adhered to by *all* other lexicographers. Again; Mr. Webster has urged in favour of *his* system of orthography, that he has "abbreviated" and omitted "all useless" letters, as well as rendered the language "uniform;" but this insertion of another *l* in compounds in which it is both *inconsistent*, "*useless*," and *not* "uniform," is rather a novel way of *abbreviating* the language! Mr. Webster has stated that, "befall, install, &c. with single *l*, would lead to a false pronunciation;" yet he has spelled withal, therewithal, wherewithal, with single *l*, in which the *a* has the same sound as in befall, &c. precisely as Johnson, Walker, &c. have spelled them!

Again; he has spelled also, always, already, &c. with single *l*, (in which *a* has the broad sound,) just as Johnson, Walker, and other lexicographers have spelled them; and there is as much fear that "single *l* would lead to a false pronunciation," in these words as in the words in which he has *doubled* the *l!* Mr. W. has observed that *l* should not be doubled in cavilled, traveller, counsellor, &c. as it is in the dictionaries of Johnson, Walker, &c. and as it was in the two *former* dictionaries of Mr. Webster; but that these words should be spelled traveler, &c. with one *l;* yet he has spelled chapelling, bordeller, medallist, metalline, metallist, metallize, clavellated, &c. with *ll*, *contrary* to his rule! Again, he has spelled cancelation and snively with single *l*, and cupellation, pannellation, wittolly, with *ll!* And he has also spelled counsellor with *ll*, contrary to his text, in defining each of the following words, twice under apply, three times under attorney, and under aulic; traveller with *ll*, contrary to his text, in defining baggage and bourn; counselling with *ll* contrary to his text, in defining abetting; fulfilment with single *l* contrary to his text, in defining accomplishment, assess, and bilk; caviller, empannelled, duelling, modelling, driveller, with *ll*, contrary to his text, in defining *findfault*, charter, contemptible, fated, and drivel; and these words above noted, *spelled contrary to his text* in his definitions, he has there spelled agreeably to Johnson

Walker, Jameson, &c.!! Thus we see in this as in all the other "innovations" of Mr. Webster, he has *contradictions* and *inconsistencies* in every possible form!

In the omission of one *l* in counselor, traveler, &c. Mr. Webster seems not to be supported by analogy; for the letter *l* is and always has been a *privileged* letter, as well as *f* and *s*, being doubled in cases where no other consonants are doubled, as ball, fell, will, roll, bull, puff, pass, puss, &c.; but cab, lad, leg, ram, ran, rap, far, met; &c. &c. have the consonants *b, d, g, m, n, p, r, t*, &c. single in the same situation. Thus in words of more than one syllable, bailiff, tariff, harass, embarrass, &c. the *f* and *s* are doubled, in the primitive and derivative words. So with *l* in the words counsellor, traveller, &c. &c. it is doubled in the derivative although single in the primitive counsel, travel, &c. for the *l* is a liquid letter, easily uniting with other letters, and has not *in any situation in the language*, the power of shortening the sounds of the vowels which precede it. This is the *reason* why *l*, in particular, is doubled in all monosyllables when all (with few exceptions, and Mr. Webster has not *corrected* those exceptions) the *other* consonants are single as shown above; and for the same *reason l*, not having the shortening power as other consonants, as above stated, is doubled in the derivative words counsellor, counselling, traveller, travelled, cavilling, &c. &c. although single in travel, &c. while the letters *t, r*, &c. are not doubled in the derivatives coveted, profited, differing, murmuring, &c. when unaccented, as the letter *l* is doubled.

In the orthography of the class of words that end in *mb*, Mr. Webster has introduced a number of "INNOVATIONS" and *inconsistencies*. Thus, he has spelled dumb, limb, and numb, with *b*; and crum without it! He has spelled dumb with *b*, and dumfound without it. He has spelled thumb and thum with *b* and without it; and has given thum without *b* the preference; and he has also spelled thumring and thumstall without *b*, and in defining thum and its derivatives he has spelled it thum without *b* seven times; but in defining finger and forefinger he has spelled it thumb with *b* three times! In his text he has spelled benum, benumming and benummed without final *b*, but in defining the words numb and torpent, he has spelled benumb, benumbing, and benumbed, with *b*, contrary to his text!

Mr. Webster has spelled matrass, carcass, &c. with *ss* in the unaccented syllable, as Walker, Johnson, and others have spelled them; but he has spelled cutlas with single *s*, contrary to them and to *analogy* and *uniformity!* for if cutlas be spelled with single *s*, matrass, &c. should be, most unquestionably. Johnson, Walker, and others, spell porpoise and tortoise with the termination *oise*, but Mr. Webster has made an "innovation" by spelling porpess (ess) to produce "uniformity" in his orthography, which "is a prime excellence in the rules of language."

Mr. Webster has spelled conscientious with *t* in the last syllable, but unconsciencious with *c*, and in defining unconsciencious, he has consciencious with *c*, contrary to his text! He has spelled analyzed with *z*, but unanalysed with *s*, and in defining unanalysed he has spelled analysed with *s*, contrary to his text! He has spelled vizard with *z*, but unvisard with *s!* He has spelled poised with *s*, but unpoized with *z*, and in defining unpoized he has spelled poized with *z*, contrary to his text! He has spelled composite and decomposite with final *e*, and deposit and reposit without *e!* He has spelled imbittered with *i*, but unembittered with *e*, and in defining unembittered he has spelled embittered, contrary to his text! He has spelled imbosom with *i*, but disembosom with *e!* He has spelled imbrangle with *i*, but disembrangle with *e!* He has spelled inthralled with *i*, but unenthralled with *e!* He has spelled inversely and adversely with *e* after *s*, but diversly without *e!* He has spelled ethereal with *e*, but in his "additions" at the close of the book, etherialize and etherialized with *i!* He has spelled referee with single *r*, but transferree with *rr!* He has spelled counselor with single *l*, but chancellor with *ll!* He has spelled entreat with *e*, but intreatful with *i*, and has defined it thus, "full of entreaty"! He has spelled analyze with *y*, but paralize with *i*, and in defining palsy in his "additions" he has paralyze with *y*, contrary to his text! He has spelled inwrap with *i*, but enwrapment with *e!* He has spelled plumtree without *b*, but hogplumbtree with it! He has spelled baize with final *e*, but maiz without it! He has spelled purslain with *ain*, but horsepurslane with *ane!* He has spelled soothe (verb) with final *e*, but smooth (verb) without it, and *oo* has the same sound in both words! He has spelled brier with *e*, but sweetbriar with *a*, and after the word he has [*sweet* and *briar*] in which he has spelled briar with *a*, contrary to his text! Again, in defining brier, he has spelled sweetbrier with *e*, contrary to his text! He has spelled gospeller and hospitaller with *ll*, but modeler and victualer, &c. with single *l!* He has spelled alledged with *d*, but allegeable and allegement without it! He has camlet without *b*, but gimblet with it, and in defining bore and wimble he has spelled gimlet without *b*, contrary to his text! He has spelled potato and wo without final *e*, but musketoe with it, and in defining batatas he has potatoe with *e*, and also in defining epoch and feel he has spelled woe with *e*, contrary to his text! He has spelled garlic without *k*, but pil-garlick with it, and after the word he has [*pilled* and *garlick*] with *k*, contrary to his text! He has laureate with *e*, but poetlaureat without it! He has spelled enchanted with *e*, but uninchanted with *i* and *e* both! He has spelled furlow (*furlough*) and plow (*plough*) with *ow*, instead of *ough*, as other lexicographers have spelled them, but he has spelled slough, thorough, &c. *with ough, as others have them!*

Mr. Webster has, in his introduction, censured Johnson, Walker, Todd, Sheridan, Jones,

&c. for their inconsistencies in the orthography of many words in which he *now* professes to have produced uniformity; as *u* in daub and *w* in bedawb; judgement with *e*, but acknowledgment without it; proveable, moveable, &c. with *e*, but reprovable, immovable, &c. without it; traveller, counsellor, with *ll* instead of single *l*: yet Mr. Webster *had* all these "inconsistencies," for which he has so strongly censured *other* lexicographers, in both his *former* dictionaries, published in 1806 and 1817; and even the word *dispatch*, of which he has said so much in his introduction, he spelled in both his *former* dictionaries despatch with *e*, as Johnson, Walker, and others have spelled it!

I should not have considered it my duty to allude to the above facts, had Mr. Webster, instead of censuring Johnson, Walker, Jones, &c. for *their* inconsistencies in the orthography of the words above noted, merely observed, that Johnson, Walker, Todd, &c. and myself (Mr. Webster) have spelled these words in this *contradictory* manner in *our* dictionaries, which I have *now* endeavoured to reduce to uniformity! The *contradictory* manner in which he has spelled the words abridgment, acknowledgment, judgment, and lodgment in his former works, would seem to require the above admission on his part: for instance; in his Spelling-Book he spelled abridgement and judgement with *e* [acknowledgment and lodgment were not in his spelling lessons]; in his dictionary, published in 1806, he spelled abridgment and acknowledgment without *e*, but judgement and lodgement with it! in his dictionary, published in 1817, he spelled *all* of them with *e*, abridgement, acknowledgement, judgement, and lodgement! in this, the American Dictionary he has spelled *all* of them without *e*, abridgment, acknowledgment, judgment, and lodgment, while abridgement and judgement have remained the same, with *e*, in his Spelling-Book, during this counter-revolution in his dictionaries!

Again; there are many other "inconsistencies" in the English language which require correction as much as those which Mr. Webster has endeavoured to reduce to uniformity; as benum without *b*, but numb with it; wreath without final *e*, but inwreathe with it; imbitter with *i*, but disembitter with *e*; dryly, dryness, shyly, and shyness, with *y*, but slily and sliness with *i*; conversable with *a*, but reversible with *i*; forbear with *ea*, despair with *ai*, and prepare with *a*, when each termination is pronounced alike, *a* long; precede, recede, secede, &c. with the termination *ede*, and exceed, proceed, and succeed, with *eed*, &c. &c. in all of which he has the *same* "inconsistencies" and "preposterous anomalies" which are in *other* dictionaries.

I will now attempt to show wherein Mr. Webster's "American Dictionary" is *particularly* objectionable as a "STANDARD OF ORTHOGRAPHY."

It is presumed that every person will readily admit, that a dictionary should, if intended to be a "standard of orthography," possess the following qualities in an eminent degree.
1. "Certain rules should be adopted and pursued through the several classes of words, and their orthography should be reduced to uniformity."—2. No innovation in orthography should be made, unless by the introduction of that innovation an "anomaly" is corrected and uniformity produced.—3. The orthography of the primitive and derivative words should be uniform and consistent.—4. The *same* words should not be differently spelled, either in the text, or in the definitions of other words; and want of *decision* in this particular alone, should be a paramount objection to the adoption of any dictionary as a "STANDARD OF ORTHOGRAPHY!"

I have already shown, it is believed, that in the first, second, and third particulars, above alluded to, Mr. Webster has not, except in a very few instances, produced uniformity, either in the "certain rules which he has adopted and pursued through the several classes of words," or in the "innovations" which he has made; and, that he has, in the orthography of primitive and derivative words, more *contradictions* than Johnson, Walker, Jones, Todd, or Jameson! yet Mr. Webster has stated that "No two English writers agree on the subject of orthography; and what is worse, no lexicographer is *consistent* with himself!" when he has more "*inconsistencies*" than all of them!!! But the fourth, and most *important* and *prominent* particular, which should be manifested on the part of the lexicographer who writes a dictionary, designed as a "standard of orthography," is *decision* in giving the orthography of each word; and I will now endeavour to show that Mr. Webster has exhibited a greater *want of decision* in this important point than any of his predecessors. First—he has spelled many words in two different ways without having given a preference, each of which he has defined *precisely* or nearly alike, and these words have been spelled but *one* way in his *former* dictionaries, and in the dictionaries of Johnson, Walker, &c.: Secondly—he has in using the words thus differently spelled in his text, in defining other words, spelled them sometimes with one orthography, and sometimes with the other: Thirdly—he has frequently spelled a word two ways, and has given a preference; but he has as often, in his definitions, used the orthography which he has *not* preferred as that which he *has* preferred: Fourthly—he has, in many instances, changed the orthography of a word, and inserted the former orthography, and has referred the reader to the *new* spelling; but he has changed the orthography of other words without having given the former orthography, or any reference to it: Fifthly—he has many words that are spelled two different ways *in his text*, which he has coupled, sometimes even without reference to their *alphabetical arrangements*, so that the reader can see the different spelling of the same wor

at *once*, which is a great convenience; but he has other words differently spelled which are *not* thus coupled, which is a great inconvenience: Sixthly—he has, in his text, coupled many words which he has spelled in two different ways, with one first in its alphabetical arrangement, and in another place the *other* word first, agreeably to the alphabetical arrangement of *that* word, in this manner, alternately giving each word thus coupled, a preference by placing it first!

First: he has spelled many words in two different ways, without having given a preference, each of which he has defined *precisely* or nearly alike, and these words have been spelled but *one* way in his *former* dictionaries, and in the dictionaries of Johnson, Walker, &c., as above stated. He has enlistment, the act of enlisting, and inlistment, the act of inlisting, but in reinlistment he has given *i* the preference! He has encase and incase, to inclose in a case! He has embolden and imbolden, to encourage! He has empeople and impeople, to form into a community! He has embody and imbody, re-embody and re-imbody, with *e* and *i* both, but unembodied with *e* only! He has apostrophe and apostrophy, with *e* and *y* both! He has greyhound and grayhound, a tall fleet dog, used in (kept for) the chase! He has encirclet and incirclet, with *e* and *i*! He has entwine and intwine, to twine, &c.! He has entwist and intwist, to twist, &c.! He has embower and imbower! He has embow and imbow, to arch, to vault! He has encrust and incrust, to cover with a crust! He has cyclopedia and cyclopede, with *ia* and *e*; and again, he has encyclopedia and encyclopedy, with *ia* and *y*! He has encumber, encumbered, encumbrance, and incumber, incumbered, incumbrance; but disencumber, disencumbered, disencumbrance, with *e* only; and incumbered and unincumbered, with *e* and *i* both! He has enforce, enforcement, with *e* only, but re-enforce, re-enforcement, re-inforce, re-inforcement, with *e* and *i* both! He has given the *three* words which end in *eed*, three *different* ways; thus, proceed and procede, with *eed* and *ede*, and *eed* placed first as the *preferable* spelling; succede and succeed, with *ede* and *eed*, and *ede* placed first; exceed one way, with *eed* only!! Again; he has spelled *all* the derivatives and compounds of these three words, and in their definitions, *eed*! He has catastrophe and catastrophy; epitome and epitomy; syncope and syncopy: synecdoche and synecdochy, with *e* and *y* both! He has sheath and sheathe (verb) with final *e* and without! &c. &c. &c.

Secondly: he has, in using the words thus differently spelled in his text, in defining other words, spelled them sometimes with one orthography, and sometimes with the other; thus, he has, in defining reinlist and reinlistment, spelled inlist with *i*, but in defining beat, engage, and enter, he has spelled it enlist, with *e*! He has, in defining impanate and incorporate, spelled embody with *e*, but in defining reimbody, he has spelled imbody with *i*! He has, in defining apostrophe and its derivatives, spelled apostrophe with *e* three times, and apostrophy with *y* three times! Again; in his explanation of "*case*," in his grammar, prefixed to the American Dictionary, he has spelled apostrophy with *y* twice! He has, in defining breathe and leash, spelled greyhound with *e*, but in defining course and stablestand, he has spelled it grayhound, with *a*! He has, in defining clog and load, spelled encumber with *e*, but in defining burden, he has spelled incumber with *i*! He has, in defining clog and load, spelled encumbrance with *e*, but in defining clear and clogging, he has spelled incumbrance with *i*! &c. &c. &c.

Thirdly: he has frequently spelled a word two ways, and has given a preference; but he has as often used the orthography in his definitions, which he has *not* preferred in his text, as that which he *has* preferred! Thus, he has spelled feather and fether with *a* and without it, and has given fether, without *a*, the preference, as "the most correct orthography;" and, in defining feather and its derivatives, he has spelled fether without *a* twenty-six times; in defining plume and its derivatives, seventeen times; in defining fledge, seven times; and in defining fowl, goose, hawk, pillow, last, quill, tick, and unfledged, he has also spelled fether without *a*; but in defining bipennate, bird, avoset, bed, bolster, crest, crane, and crow, he has spelled feather with *a*! He has spelled leather and lether with *a* and without it, and has given lether, without *a*, the preference, as "the most correct orthography;" and in defining leather and its derivatives, he has spelled lether without *a* nine times; and, in defining last, leash, moccason, pocket-book, shoe, and thong, he has also spelled lether without *a*; but in defining air-jacket, alutation, awl, apron, ball, bind, bandoleers, buckskin, cordwainer, coriaceous, and cushion, he has spelled leather with *a*! He has, in defining leather and quail-pipe, spelled lethern without *a*; but in defining bandoleers and hose, he has leathern with *a*! He has spelled villainy and villany with *i* in the second syllable, and without it, and has given villany, without *i*, the preference; and, in defining villain and its derivatives, and archvillany, he has spelled it villany, without *i*, six times; but in defining enormity, flagitiousness, exceed, outrageous, and outvillain, he has spelled villainy with *i*! He has spelled steadfast, steadfastness, steady, and stedfast, stedfastness, and steddy, with *a* and without it, and has, in defining steady, steadfast, and their derivatives, spelled stedfast without *a* four times, stedfastness without *a* twice, steddy without *a* nine times, and steddiness without *a* six times, and stedfastness without *a*, in defining immovability, stedfast without *a*, in defining immovable; but in defining firm, stable, and resolute, he has spelled steady with *a*; in defining firmness and fixedness, he has steadfastness with *a*; and in defining fixation, resolution, stability, and stableness, he has also spelled steadiness

with *a!* He has spelled sovereign and suveran, and has given suveran the preference, as "the true spelling;" and in defining suveran and its derivatives, he has spelled suveran with *u* seven times, and suveranty once; but in defining sovereign and its derivatives, he has spelled sovereign with *o*, and in defining empress he has sovereignty with *o!* He has spelled nuisance and nusance with *i* and without it, and in defining nuisance he has spelled nusance without *i*; but in defining abate and its derivatives, he has spelled nuisance with *i* three times! &c. &c. &c.

Fourthly: he has, in many instances, changed the orthography of a word, and inserted the former orthography, and has referred the reader to the *new* spelling; but he has changed the orthography of other words without having given the former orthography, or any reference to it. Thus, he has "bridegroom [see bridegoom,]" which is the *new* spelling; he has "cloak [see cloke,]" which is the *new* spelling; "ensure [see insure;]" he has "endorse [see indorse;]" he has "cruise [see cruse;]" "chemist [see chimist,]" &c. &c. &c.; but he has changed the orthography of the words mosk, ribin, cutlas, skain, sherif, tarif, gimblet, porpcss, &c. &c., without having given the *former* orthography, which is mosque, riband, cutlass, skein, sheriff, tariff, gimlet, porpoise, &c., or any reference to it in his text!

Fifthly: he has many words spelled two different ways in his text, which he has coupled, sometimes even without reference to their alphabetical arrangement, so that the reader can see the different spelling of the *same* word at once; but he has other words differently spelled, which are *not* thus coupled, which is a great inconvenience. Thus, he has, in the text, coupled crier and cryer, croop and croup, boose and bouse, tongue and tung, feather and fether, leather and lether, villain and villan, sluice and sluse, crout and krout, polype and polypus, nuisance and nusance, steady and steddy, &c. &c.; but he has *not* coupled boosy and bousy, chemist and chimist, chemistry and chimistry, bridegroom and bridegoom, sovereign and suveran, gipsey and gypsey, &c. &c.

Sixthly: he has, in his text, coupled many words which he has spelled two different ways with one first in its alphabetical arrangement, and in another place the *other* word first, agreeably to the alphabetical arrangement of *that* word, in this manner alternately giving each word, thus coupled, a preference, by placing it first! Thus, he has croop and croup, croup and croop; boose and bouse, bouse and boose, &c. &c.

In addition to the preceding, Mr. Webster has spelled many words in *three* different ways, which have heretofore been spelled in *one* way only. Thus, he has height, highth, hight; raindeer, ranedeer, reindeer; paroquet, paroket, perroquet, &c. &c. Although Mr. Webster has spelled so many words differently, yet he has observed under the word cion, that "different modes of spelling the same word are very inconvenient." Still he has *five* times as much *variable* and *contradictory* spelling as *all* other lexicographers!!

Thus, I have, in six prominent particulars, endeavoured to show wherein Mr. Webster's dictionary is objectionable as a "Standard of orthography." In doing this, I have merely given a few general examples of each class, and have left it with the *critical* reader to examine more *particularly* as inclination and leisure shall dictate.

I will now take notice of some of the discrepances in the orthography of the words in the text and definitions of Mr. Webster's Dictionary. I have already taken notice of some of the discrepances in the orthography of Mr. Webster's definitions and text; but those were words which are *differently* spelled in the *text*, with or without preference being given. The discrepances of which I shall now take notice are those in which the words are spelled, in the *definitions*, differently from the *text* of the American Dictionary. Many of these words are spelled, in the definitions, agreeably to the text of Johnson, Walker, Jameson, &c.; others agreeably to neither; and many of them are spelled agreeably to Webster's *Spelling-Book*, contrary to his *dictionary* and those of Johnson, Walker, &c. It is, unquestionably, of the greatest importance that the orthography of the words used in the definitions of a dictionary, should agree with that of the text, as those who use the dictionary will have this *erroneous* orthography continually before them, if disagreeing with the text, until they become familiar with it, and will often make use of this *incorrect* orthography in spelling.

That Mr. Webster himself considers it important that there should be an agreement in the orthography of the definitions and text, appears evident from the fact that he has, at the close of the American Dictionary, in his "Corrections" inserted a note in which he has shown that Johnson wrote *despatch* with *i*, instead of *e*, in his definitions, contrary to his text.—This note it seems should have been inserted in the introduction where he has spoken of *dispatch*; and, it is thus, in his "Corrections," introduced. "Under *dispatch*, in the introduction, add; Dr. Johnson himself wrote *dispatch*. The word thus written occurs twice in his dictionary under *send*, and five times under *speed*, and this orthography has been continued to the present time. It has been transcribed into all the dictionaries made from Johnson's, at least into all which I have examined, even down to Chalmers and Jameson." Yet Mr. Webster "*himself*" not only spelled the word *despatch* with *e* in the text of his two *former* dictionaries, [see page 13] *precisely* as Johnson and Walker have spelled it, but he actually had the word *dispatch* with *i* under the *same* words *send* and *speed*, contrary to his own text, in his dictionary published in 1806, and also under the words expedience, expedite, and expeditiously in the same dictionary! He likewise spelled dispatch with i, contrary to his text, under the word *send*, in his dictionary published in 1817!

In this the American Dictionary, Mr. Webster has, under the word *betrust* and its derivatives, spelled *entrust* with *e*, instead of *i*, contrary to his text, six times, and once in his preface! Thus, we have the following singular coincidence: Johnson made use of *i* instead of *e* in *despatch*, contrary to his text, "*twice* under *send*, and *five* times under *speed*;" and Mr. Webster has made use of *e* instead of *i* in *intrust*, contrary to his text, *six* times under *betrust*, and *once* in his preface—*two* and *five* are *seven*—*six* and *one* are *seven*!!

Perhaps there never was among the acts of any author, a more *illiberal* and *ungenerous* act than that of Mr. Webster's inserting the preceding note in his Dictionary, relative to Dr. Johnson and the word *despatch*, when he had *himself* COPIED the *blunder* into his former dictionaries, under the *same* words!!

From the preceding note, it is evident that Mr. Webster *does* consider it of importance, that the orthography of the definitions and text should be alike, and I will, *therefore*, show that Mr. Webster is far from *uniformity* and *consistency*, in this important particular.

Many of these words are spelled in the definitions of the American dictionary as they have been for many years in Webster's spelling-book, contrary to the text of *all* Webster's dictionaries; and, also contrary to the text of Johnson, Walker, &c.

He has achievment, contrary to his text (achievement) *eighteen* times under the following words; fabulous, gest, glorious, hatchment, heroic, labor, merit, might, obelisk, panegyric, perform, portray, pride, productive, twice under renown, rich and scald: He has cholic, contrary to his text (colic) under bias: He has cobler, contrary to his text (cobbler) *five* times under the words botcher, last, ride, and souter: He has holiday, contrary to his text (holyday, *eight* times under the words calends, even, fair, ferial, three times under feriation, and highday: He has briar, contrary to his text (brier) under rose: He has *faggot*, contrary to his text (fagot) *five* times under the words bavin, dunnage, and kid: He has bason, contrary to his text (basin) *eight* times under the words font, goldfish, muller, pelvis, pool, rocksalt, reservoir, and rim: He has cyder, contrary to his text (cider) *five* times under the words bottle, brandy, brisk, distill, and perkin: He has chesnut, contrary to his text (chestnut) *ten* times under the words bay, beaver, beech, bur, earthnut, fieldfare, mastful, mate, and tannin: He has cyderkin, contrary to his text (ciderkin) under perkin and purre: He has cypher, contrary to his text (cipher) *six* times under the words binary, cryptography, fraction, key, monogram, and round: He has sheriff, contrary to his text (sherif) *fifty-three* times under the words accountable, advance, admeasurement, approver, array, breve, calendar, candidate, cheriff, commit, conservator, constitute, coroner, county, custody, deputation, depute and its derivatives, discharge, distringas, elisor, empannel, escape, esquire, execution, exigent, extend, extent, fee, fierifacias, imprisonment, informing, inquest, jail, lawday, landgrave, liveryman, mainprize, marshal, nisiprius, outlaw, outrider, oyes, office, palsgrave, panel, peace-officer, and pipe: He has mizen, contrary to his text (mizzen) *eighteen* times under the words admiral, aftersails, bagpipe, bark, brail, bumkin, courses, dogger, driver, flag, frigatoon, gaff, galiot, crossjack, howker, ketch, and ship: He has plaintiff, contrary to his text (plaintif) *fifty-six* times under the words account, appellor, avoid, bail, blank, bar, capias, champerty, cognizance, cognizee, cognizor, competent, complainant, compurgation, cost, counsel, crossbill, crossexamine, day, decide, declare, declaration, default, defense, delay, demand, demandant, demur, elegit, enjoin, discontinuance, find, imparlance, injunction, lie, make, merge, nonability, nonproficient, nonsuit, object, objection, and party: He has embitter, contrary to his text (imbitter) *fourteen* times under the words disquietude, edge, empoison, envenom, exasperate, and impoison: He has hindrance, contrary to his text (hinderance) *seven* times under the words arrest, bar, check, counteraction, cross, forbidding, and passport: He has licence, contrary to his text (license) *seven* times under the words curate, effrenation, fly, imparl, imparlance, limiter, and scurrilous: He has abridgement, contrary to his text (abridgment) under the word cote: He has spelled paroquet, paroket, and perroquet, three *different* ways in his text; and, under the word anaca, he has spelled it parokeet, and under lory he has spelled it parroquet, *both* contrary to *all* three of the words in his text! He has diarrhæa and diarrhœa, *both* contrary to his text (diarrhea) under the words lax, looseness, coeliac and colliquative! He has carcase, contrary to his text (carcass) under the words anhima, corps, mortar, and quarter: He has liquorice, contrary to his text (licorice) under astragal and ginseng: He has asafœtida, and assafetida, both contrary to his text (asafetida) under bag and gumresin! He has ribband and ribbon, both contrary to his text (ribin) under flare and pendent! He has sirrup and syrup, both contrary to his text (sirup) under the words capillaire, consistency, eclegm, hippocras, and lohock: He has cameleon and chamelion, both contrary to his text (chameleon) under knack and lizard! He has etherial, contrary to his text (ethereal) *five* times under the words heaven, quintessence, skim, same and region: He has sallad, contrary to his text (salad) under the words beetradish and lenten: He has serjeant, contrary to his text (sergeant) under the words advocate, attorney, counsel, lawyer, and petit: He has merchandize, contrary to his text (merchandise) *eighteen* times under the words article, book-keeping, broker, buckram, cargo, chaffer, cocket, commodity, curator, custom, emporium, export, exporter, goods, gross, guard, innocency, and kidder: He has entrust, contrary to his text (intrust) *fifty-one* times under the words account, address, adjourn, administration, agency, answer, bail, behight, cash-keeper, charge, commend, commission, commit, commitment, confide, concredit, confident, confider, counsel, defaulter, delegate, demand, deposite, eleemosy-

ry, embezzle, employ, financier, guardian, intimate, lovetale, office, paymaster, peculate, peculation, peculator, privy-seal, regency, responsible, and sequestration; He has woe, contrary to his text (wo) *ten* times under the words deliver, epoch, eternize, feel, join, mockery, mortal, pineful, pomp, and respond: He has ensnare, contrary to his text (insnare) *twenty-six* times under the words benet, captious, captive, catch, deceit, deceive, and their derivatives, entoil, entrap, gudgeon, hamper, hook, illaqueate, luck, mesh, noose, pit, and take: He has caravansera, contrary to his text (caravansary) under ammonia: He has enterprize, contrary to his text (enterprise) *eight* times under the words abandon, adventure and its derivatives, advisedly, chevisance, expedition, and over: He has tranquility, contrary to his text (tranquillity) *twelve* times under the words composedness, agitation, composure, disquiet and its derivatives, halcyon, and under quiet and its derivatives: He has decypher, contrary to his text (decipher) under the words blazoned and cipher: He has phrenzy, contrary to his text (phrensy) under phrenitis: He has bishoprick, contrary to his text (bishopric) under erection: He has hammock, contrary to his text (hammoc) under netting: He has courtezan, contrary to his text (courtesan) under penitent: He has highthen and highten, both contrary to his text (heighten) under the word irritate, twice under enhance, and twice under exaggerate! He has plough, contrary to his text (plow) under new: He has faulchion, contrary to his text (falchion) under bite and saber: He has intreat, contrary to his text (entreat) under the words appetence, deprecate, and obsecrate: He has vermillion, contrary to his text (vermilion) under the words miniate and minious: He has chuse, contrary to his text (choose) twice under arbitration: He has guaranteed, contrary to his text (guarantied) under peace: He has cauldron, contrary to his text (caldron) under enchant and flaw: He has waggon, contrary to his text (wagon) under caisson and matross: He has woodchuck, contrary to his text (woodchuk) under marmot: He has hazle, contrary to his text (hazel) under catkin, cobnut, julus, nut, and rod: He has enquire, contrary to his text (inquire) under beseech, character, consulting, consulted, and nose: He has also enquiry, contrary to his text (inquiry) under arrive, examen, consult, and curious: He has maize, contrary to his text (maiz) under articulation, breadcorn, cop, and broomcorn: He has reverie, contrary to his text (revery) once under dump, and three times under disentrance: He has intreaty, contrary to his text (entreaty) under deprecation, flexible, and obsecration: He has gilliflower, contrary to his text (gillyflower) under carnation, caryphylloid, lay, and damewort: He has spinnet, contrary to his text (spinet) twice under manichord: He has spiggot, contrary to his text (spigot) under faucet: He has crumb, contrary to his text (crum) under particle: He has neighbour, contrary to his text (neighbor) under recess: He has flageolet, contrary to his text (flagelet) under recorder: He has tambour, contrary to his text (tambor) under morrice: He has pennyless, contrary to his text (penniless) under less: He has vertebrae, contrary to his text (vertebre) under loin and neck: He has girroc, contrary to his text (girrock) under lacertus: He has critick, contrary to his text (critic) under persuade: He has antick, contrary to his text (antic) under mummer: He has fibre, contrary to his text (fiber) under fibrolite and peristaltic: He has avoirdupoise, contrary to his text (avoirdupois) under bahar and decagram: He has centinel, contrary to his text (sentinel) under garret: He has pontiff, contrary to his text (pontif) under asiarch, lama, and papal: He has raccoon, contrary to his text (racoon) under coati: He has burthen, contrary to his text (burden) *seven* times under barge, buss, cat, coaster, condition, and tunnage: He has balluster, contrary to his text (baluster) under nave, and twice under rail: He has ballustrade, contrary to his text (balustrade) under rail and sanctuary: He has havoc, contrary to his text (havock) under fray: He has engraft, contrary to his text (ingraft) *five* times under applegraft, cleftgraft, receive, and imp: He has pretence, contrary to his text (pretense) under belie, government, hypocrisy, and maroon: He has preterite, contrary to his text (preterit) under arose, ate, and conge: He has benefitted, contrary to his text (benefited) under advantaged: He has analyse, contrary to his text (analyze) under hedenbergite and reviewed: He has anglicise, contrary to his text (anglicize) under bivouac and reveille: He has gamut, contrary to his text (gammut) under scale and the letter F: He has enwrap, contrary to his text (inwrap) *six* times under circumplication, intrigue, infold, roll, and whipped: He has sadler, contrary to his text (saddler) under the words artificer and awl: He has partizan, contrary to his text (partisan) *four* times under contention and jacobite! He has cimitar, contrary to his text (cimiter) under saber: He has pedlar, contrary to his text (pedler) *four* times under hawker, piepoudre and huckster: He has gypsey, contrary to his text (gipsey) *four* times under bind, cymbal, deity, and dent: He has halbert, contrary to his text (halberd) *three* times under fieldstaff, glair, and sergeant: He has ton, contrary to his text (tun) *five* times under caravel, freight, and prisage: He has sulkey, contrary to his text (sulky) under carriage: He has casque, contrary to his text (cask) under harness and armor: He has batoon and baton in the text, but under the word scarp he has battoon, contrary to both of them! He has superintendance, contrary to his text (superintendence) under chancellor, consignee, and seneschal: He has taffety, contrary to his text (taffeta) under aridas and fair: He has embosom, contrary to his text (imbosom) under *imposing* and isle: He has empannel, contrary to his text (impannel) *three times* under petit and jury: He has tipler, contrary to his text (tippler) under drinker

and drinkinghouse: He has also tipling, contrary to his text (tippling) under alehouse; He has tatling, contrary to his text (tattling) under futile and garrulity: He has also tatler, contrary to his text (tattler) under blow: He has turnip, contrary to his text (turnep) under rape: He has stupify, contrary to his text (stupefy) under doze, drunk, dull, and fox: He has frolic, contrary to his text (frolick) under ape and curvet: He has slyly, contrary to his text (slily) under closely, peep, and subtly: He has clue, contrary to his text (clew) under goosewing: He has dependant, contrary to his text (dependent) *four* times under hangeron, retainer, and satellite: He has headache, contrary to his text (headach) *five* times under complain, for, and cephalic: He has saviour, contrary to his text (savior) under scene: He has fulness, contrary to his text (fullness) under blissfulness, branchiness, buffel, and complement: He has dulness, contrary to his text (dullness) under amblyopy and constitutional: He has respite, contrary to his text (respit) under act and breath: He has unskilful, contrary to his text (unskillful) under artless and bad: He has unskilfully, contrary to his text (unskillfully) *five* times under badly, botch, botched, ignorant, and ignorantly! He has musrol, under bit, and mussroll under martingal, both contrary to his text (musrole)! He has parsnip, contrary to his text (parsnep) under caraway: He has furze, contrary to his text (furz) under crake and kid: He has fulfil, contrary to his text (fulfill) *eleven* times—once under each of the words accomplish, complete, compliment, defaulting, effectuate, engagement, and four times under comply! He has traveller, contrary to his text (traveler) under caravan: He has worshipping, contrary to his text (worshiping) under fornication: He has worshipper, contrary to his text (worshiper) under gentile: He has whiskey, contrary to his text (whisky) under spirit: He has wilfulness, contrary to his text (willfulness) under farm: He has skilfulness, contrary to his text (skillfulness) under featness: He has worshipped, contrary to his text (worshiped) *five* times under abracadabra, achor, adored, feticism, and profess: He has wilfully, contrary to his text (willfully) under contumacious and prevaricate: He has duellist, contrary to his text (duelist) under bravery and combatant: He has revelling, contrary to his text (reveling) *four* times—once under carouse, and three times under bacchanalian! He has dialling, contrary to his text (dialing) *four* times—once under each of the words declinator and horologe, and twice under gnomonics! He has wilful, contrary to his text (willful) *three* times under barratry, contumacy, and guilt: He has thresh, contrary to his text (thrash) *four* times under beat, grant, pile, and stover: He has travelling, contrary to his text (traveling) *six* times under circulatorious, coach, fancy, far, forge, gest: He has fulfilment, contrary to his text (fulfillment) *four* times under breach, break, compliment, and expletion: He has skilfully, contrary to his text (skillfully) *five* times under artfully, defly, dextrously, discerningly, and fencing: He has skilful, contrary to his text (skillful) *twenty-seven* times—once under each of the words adroit, adroitly, agriculturist, artist, connoisseur, cope, dancer, deftly, distance, exercised, experienced, expert, expertly, express, feat, fierceness, find, manager, please, and twice under each of the words clever, con, cunning, and dextrous! &c. &c.

When I commenced the exposition of the *discrepances* in the orthography of the definitions and text in the American Dictionary, I intended to show *all* which I had discovered; but they are so numerous that the limits of this review will not permit me to pursue the exposition farther. I have already shown between *seven* and *eight hundred* discrepances of this kind, and have noted about *five hundred* others. Enough has been given, it is believed, however, to convince the reader of the evident want of *uniformity* and *consistency* in the orthography of the definitions and text. The candid reader can readily judge whether it is justifiable on the part of Mr. Webster to *censure* or *condemn* Johnson's discrepances in his definitions and text, when he has more than *twelve hundred* in his *own* dictionary, some of which are evidently *copied* from Johnson's dictionary, for they appear under the *same* words in *both* dictionaries! [See pages 13, 15, 16, and 17.] Having thus pointed out some of the most prominent *defects*, *inconsistencies*, and *contradictions* in the American Dictionary, which are much *more numerous* than in any other dictionary, I will now show, that the "*innovations* and *anomalies*" introduced by Mr. Webster in his several books, have done *more* to introduce irregularity in orthography, than *all* of the other works published in this country and in England within fifty years, even if we take his American Dictionary for the "STANDARD." I will also show that nearly all of the *errours* in spelling which now appear on almost every page of the best written books and periodical publications, and in nearly every column of our newspapers, have been introduced and kept in use through the medium of his Spelling-Book and former dictionaries, the orthography of which is now *rejected* by him in his American Dictionary!

First: he spelled a great many words in the spelling lessons of his Spelling-Book, contrary to the *text* of all *his* dictionaries, and *that* of Johnson and Walker; and, this *contradictory* orthography has been continued in his Spelling-Book and dictionary more than twenty years!!

Thus, ancle, achievment, boult, bass, (*a* long,) biggen, chace, calimanco, chalibeate, cholic, clench, cobler, doat, epaulette, enthral, etherial, faggot, frolic, fellon, grey, goslin, hindrance, halloe, impale, jocky, laste, laquey, negociate, noggen, phrenzy, paroxism, *rince, sadler, sallad, staunch, streight*, seignor, shoar, tatler, thresh, &c. &c., instead of ankle, *achievement, bolt, base, biggin*, chase, calamanco, chalybeate, colic, clinch, cobbler, dote,

epaulet, inthral, ethereal, fagot, frolick, felon, gray, gosling, hinderance, halloo, empale, jockey, last, lackey, negotiate, noggin, phrensy, paroxysm, rinse, saddler, salad, stanch, straight, seignior, shore, tattler, thrash, &c. &c.

The first and *incorrect* spelling of these words above noted, will not only be found in our best publications and newspapers of the present day, but so great has been the influence of the *incorrect* orthography of these words, that not less than ten or fifteen *authors* of Spelling-Books, compiled since Webster's, in this country, have *copied* most of these *errours* from Mr. Webster's Spelling-Book! and even Mr. Webster "*himself*" has spelled nearly all of these words in this *erroneous* manner in the definitions of the American Dictionary!! [See pages 16, 17, and 18, of this Review.]

Secondly: he has spelled many words in his dictionary published in 1806, contrary to his Spelling-Book, and also contrary to his dictionary published in 1817: thus, abridgment, buccaneer, callico, doctrin, determin, enterprise, examin, havock, medicin, opposit, perquisit, requisit, &c. &c.

Thirdly: he has spelled many words in his dictionary published in 1817, contrary to his Spelling-Book, and also contrary to his dictionary published in 1806: thus, aidecamp, bucaneer, enrollment, pnumatics, sepulchre, tennon, woolen, &c. &c.

Fourthly: in his dictionary published in 1817, he changed the orthography of many words, which, in the dictionary of 1806, were contrary to his Spelling-Book, and conformed them to the orthography of his Spelling-Book, in accordance with the dictionaries of Johnson and Walker: thus, apposite, blameable, calico, determine, doctrine, examine, medicine, opposite, perquisite, requisite, &c. &c.

Fifthly: he spelled many words in both his former dictionaries *contrary* to his Spelling-Book, which he has *now* spelled, in the American Dictionary, *agreeably* to his former Spelling-Book, and in accordance with the orthography of Johnson and Walker! thus, apostrophe, avoirdupois, bombasin, catastrophe, imagine, libertine, mackerel, quadrille, quarantine, radish, &c. &c.

Sixthly: he has now, in the American Dictionary, spelled many words agreeably to Johnson and Walker, but which were spelled differently from them in both his former dictionaries and Spelling-Book, whereby an orthography has for many years been taught through the medium of those books, which he now acknowledges to have been *erroneous*, by adopting the orthography of Johnson and Walker in these words: thus, bucanier, diphthong, guaranty, (verb,) merchandise, potato, raillery, triphthong, &c. &c.

Seventhly: he has introduced many "innovations" in the American Dictionary, which he has *not* "reduced to uniformity," and has, therefore, *increased*, rather than *diminished* the "anomalies" in our language. [See pages 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11; see also pages, 47, 48 49, &c.]

Thus I have endeavoured to examine the American Dictionary fairly and candidly, and to compare it with the dictionaries of Johnson, Walker, Jameson, Todd, and others, and I regret the conclusion, that it is more *erroneous*, less *uniform* and *consistent*, than any one of them, and, if adopted as "A STANDARD," must lay the foundation of more numerous *contradictions* and "*anomalies*" than at present exist in the language. And here I could wish that I did not feel myself bound to animadvert upon what I deem illiberality on the part of the author of the American Dictionary towards former lexicographers, most of whom are now "beyond the reach, and out of hearing of his complaints," and, therefore, unable to answer him. If the author of the American Dictionary, who has enjoyed the advantages of their publications, has more *contradictions*, *inconsistencies*, and *anomalies*, than they have, and more than *twelve hundred* discrepances in his text and definitions, surely charity should have induced him to throw a mantle over half of that number in the earlier works of Johnson, Walker, and others. If he can claim to be justified in violating his *own rules and principles* in the great number of instances shown in this review, surely other lexicographers may claim commiseration for minor "anomalies" and less important "contradictions." If the real object of the author of the American Dictionary was "to purify the language from palpable errors, and reduce the number of its anomalies; to rescue it from the mischievous influence of sciolists, and that dabbling spirit of innovation which is perpetually disturbing its settled usages;" it is difficult to conceive upon what principles he can justify the number of INNOVATIONS, CONTRADICTIONS, and ANOMALIES, with which his work abounds.

REVIEW

OF

WEBSTER'S OCTAVO DICTIONARY.

[*The copy, quoted in this Review, bears date* 1831.]

SUBSEQUENT to the publication of the "Quarto American Dictionary," Mr. Webster informed the publick (through the medium of the New York Evening Post, May 28, 1829,) that an abridgment of this quarto, in an octavo form, would soon be published, which would "comprise all the words in the quarto, with some additions, and with the chief etymologies and full definitions." From this advertisement, we might reasonably infer that the *orthography* in the quarto and in the octavo, *agree* in the *text* if not in the *definitions*. I have compared all the *contradictions*, *inconsistencies*, and *anomalies*, which I have pointed out as contained in the quarto, with the octavo abridgment; and I will now show the result of that comparison. This exposition, it is presumed, will be considered proper and fair; for, although it is stated in the preface to the octavo abridgment, that "as the author of the original work has intrusted the superintendence of the Abridgment to another person, he is not to be considered as responsible for any of the modifications already alluded to. The quarto edition will, of course, be considered as presenting his exact views of the proper arrangement and exhibition of words in respect to their orthography and pronunciation;" yet it is believed that he (Mr. Webster) *is* and *should* be *responsible* for the correctness or incorrectness of the orthography in the octavo, inasmuch as it is titled with *his* name, and *not* Worcester's, and is given to the publick under his authority only, the name of Mr. Worcester not appearing on the titlepage, or at the end of the preface. I shall, therefore, consider the octavo *Webster's*, and, with this opinion, shall proceed to point out the *variations* in orthography from the quarto, made in the octavo—that a part of the orthography objected to in the preceding review has been changed in the text of the octavo, agreeably to the orthography of Johnson and Walker—that nearly all the *contradictions* and *inconsistencies* in the orthography of the text still *remain* in the octavo; and, I will also show in what manner and wherein many of the discrepances in the text and definitions of the quarto, "*are corrected*" in the octavo, viz. by changing the orthography in the *text* of the octavo, and making it agreeable to the orthography of Walker! The other discrepances, with few exceptions, *remain* as in the quarto. The *inconsistencies* and *contradictions* in the orthography of the class of words which end in *ck*, pointed out on pages 7 and 8, remain the same in the octavo, except the following which are *contradictory*: thus,

Quarto.	*Octavo.*	*Quarto.*	*Octavo.*
Almanack,	Almanac,	Hattock,	Hattoc,
Hemlock,	Hemloc,	Hillock,	Hilloc,
Mattock,	Mattoc,	Almanack-maker.	Almanac-maker.

The following *inconsistency* in the quarto, pointed out on page 8, is retained in the octavo. He has spelled *mimic*, when a noun, without *k*, and with it when a verb; yet, he has made no such distinction in the words *frolick* and *traffick*, having spelled them with *k* in both cases.

The class of words which usually end in *re*, Mr. Webster spelled in the quarto with *er*, as stated on page 9; thus *accouter*, *center*, *maneuver*, &c. and their derivatives; and these words were thus spelled in the definitions in the quarto: but we find these words and their derivatives *changed* in the octavo agreeable to Walker, and also in the definitions, although Mr. Webster has strongly *condemned* this termination *re*, in the introduction to the quarto! Mr. Webster remarks, "in the present instance, want of uniformity is not the only evil.—The present orthography has introduced an awkward mode of writing the derivatives, for example, *centred*, *sceptred*, *sepulchred*." Yet, we find these words and their derivatives spelled *re* in the octavo in the *text* and *definitions*, agreeably to Walker and Johnson, *contrary* to the principle above quoted which is contained in the quarto! Thus they appear in the two dictionaries:

Quarto.	*Octavo.*	*Quarto.*	*Octavo.*
Accouter,	Accoutre, Accouter,	Center,	Centre, Center,
Accoutering,	Accoutring,	Centering,	Centring,
Accoutered,	Accoutred,	Centered,	Centred,
Accouterments,	Accoutrements,	Concenter,	Concentre, Concenter,
Amphitheater,	Amphitheatre, Amphitheater,	Concentering,	Concentring,

Quarto.	*Octavo.*
Concentered,	Concentred,
Fiber,	Fibre, Fiber,
Luster,	Lustre, Luster,
Maneuver, (*n.* and *v.*)	Manœuvre, (*n.*) Maneuver, Manœuvre, (*v.*)
Maneuvering,	Manœuvring,
Maneuvered,	Manœuvred,
Meter,	Metre, Meter,
Miter, (*n.* and *v.*)	Mitre, Miter, (*n.*) Mitre, (*v.*)
Mitered,	Mitred,
Niter,	Nitre, Niter,
Ocher,	Ochre, Ocher,
Ocherous,	Ochreous,
Scepter,	Sceptre, Scepter,

Quarto.	*Octavo.*
Sceptered,	Sceptred,
Sepulcher, (*n.* and *v.*)	Sepulchre, (*n.*) Sepulcher, Sepulchre, (*v.*)
Sepulchering,	Sepulchring,
Sepulchered,	Sepulchred,
Specter,	Spectre, Specter,
Verteber,	Vertebre, Verteber,
Omber, Ombre,	Ombre, Omber,
Peter, Petre,	Petre, Peter,
Saber, Sabre,	Sabre, Saber,
Saber, (*v.*)	Sabre, (*v.*)
Saltpeter, Saltpetre,	Saltpetre, Saltpeter,
Theater, Theatre,	Theatre, Theater,
Massacer, Massacre, (*v.* & *n.*)	Massacre, Massacer, Massacre, *n.*

Thus we see that in the octavo the termination *re* is preferred in *all* cases in the class of words above given, except in reconnoiter, reconnoitering, and reconnoitered which he has spelled *er*, contrary to *all* of the others in the text of the octavo!; and, that *er* is preferred in *all* cases in the quarto! and the *re* is given in all cases in the definitions in the octavo, but *er* in the quarto, as *center*, *luster*, &c. *centre*, *lustre*, &c. so that there are *hundreds* of *contradictions* in the orthography of this class of words in the definitions of the quarto and octavo! This class of words forms one of the most prominent distinctions between the orthography of Mr. Walker and Webster, and it is one for which Mr. Webster and the friends of the quarto claim as much as for that of any other *pretended* IMPROVEMENT in the orthography of the American Dictionary; and, Mr. Webster has *condemned* the orthography of the termination *re* (both in the quarto and in his dictionary published in 1806) *more strongly* than that of any other class of words in which he disagrees with Johnson and Walker! The *contradictions* between the quarto and octavo in this class of words *alone*, (in the *text* and *definitions*,) amount to more than *all* the contradictions contained in the whole of Johnson's Dictionary!

The class of words which usually end in *ff*, Mr. Webster, in the quarto, spelled generally with single *f*, in the dissyllables and trisyllables, either in his text or in the "*corrections*" at the close of his dictionary; and, he gave the *single f* the preference; but, in the octavo he has spelled these words *differently* and has *preferred* the *ff*, both in the text and definitions! Thus, the discrepances in the orthography of the text and definitions in this class of words contained in the quarto, pointed out on page 10, "*are corrected* in the octavo." The words of this class are *changed* in the text agreeably to Walker, consequently these words agree with the definitions in the octavo! These words are spelled in the manner following, in the octavo and quarto: thus—

Quarto.	*Octavo.*
Bailiff (*text*)	Bailiff
Bailif (CORRECTIONS)	Bailif
Caitiff (*text*)	Caitiff
Caitif (*cor.*)	Caitif
Dandruff (*text*)	Dandruff
Dandruf (*cor.*)	
Mastiff (*text*)	Mastiff
Mastif (*cor.*)	Mastif
Plaintif	Plaintiff Plaintif
Pontif	Pontiff Pontif
Archpontiff	Archpontiff
Restif (*n.*)	Restiff (*n.*)
Restifness	Restiffness
Restif (*a.*)	Restiff Restif (*a.*)

Quarto.	*Octavo.*
Sherif	Sheriff Sherif
Deputysheriff	Deputysheriff Deputysherif
Boundbailiff	Boundbailiff
Bumbailiff	Bumbailiff
Undersherif	Undersheriff
Distaff	Distaff
Hippogriff	Hippogriff
Midriff	Midriff
Cliff (*text*)	Cliff
Clif (*cor.*)	
Distaffthistle	Distaffthistle
Tarif (*n.* & *v.*)	Tariff Tarif (*n.*) Tariff (*v.*)
Sherifalty	Sheriffalty

Quarto.	*Octavo.*	*Quarto.*	*Octavo.*
Sherifdom	Sheriffdom	Sherifwick	Sheriffwick
Sherifship	Sheriffship	Undersherifry	Undersheriffry.

From an examination of the orthography of the preceding class of words, we shall discover that the termination *ff* is preferred in *every* instance in the octavo, both in the *text* and *definitions;* and, that their orthography is *contradictory* in the quarto, although *single f* is preferred in that dictionary! [See page 10.]

The *contradictory* manner in which the words that end with *ance*, *anse*, and *ense*, in the quarto, pointed out on page 10, remains the *same* in the octavo, except *entrance*.

In the orthography of the words which end with *ch* or *che*, pointed out as contradictory in the quarto, on page 10, a number of variations has been made in the octavo; thus,

Quarto.	*Octavo.*	*Quarto.*	*Octavo.*
Ache }	Ache }	Unaking	Unaching
Ake }	Ake }	Boneache	Boneache
Aching }	Aching }	Headach	Headache
Aking }	Aking }	Heartach	Heartache

In defining *ake*, he has tooth*ake* with *k*, contrary to his text, tooth*ache*, as in the quarto!

The *contradictions* and *inconsistencies* in the orthography of the class of words which end in *l* or *ll*, pointed out on page 11, *remain* the same in the octavo in the *text;* but, a few corrections have been made in the definitions, under the words baggage, abetting, accomplishment, bilk, find-fault, drivel, and abracadabra. Nearly all of the other *contradictions* pointed out on page 12, remain in the octavo, as vizard with *z*, unvisard with *s*, &c.

The *innovations* and *inconsistencies* pointed out on page 12, *remain* in the octavo, except the following; thus—

Quarto.		*Octavo.*	*Quarto.*	*Octavo.*
Etherialize }	*Additions.*	Etherealize }	Allegement	Alledgement
Etherialized }		Etherealized }	Thumring	Thumbring
Allegeable		Alledgeable	Thumstall	Thumbstall

He has gim*b*let with *b* in the definition of the word *bore*, in the octavo.

It will be seen by reference to page 13, that I pointed out several rules and principles which a "*Standard of Orthography*" should possess in an eminent degree; and on that page particularly specified wherein the quarto is objectionable, as the *same* words are differently spelled in the text and in the definitions, and that there is want of *decision* in this particular which is a paramount objection to the adoption of any dictionary as a "STANDARD OF ORTHOGRAPHY."

The objections preferred against the orthography of the quarto are thus given on page 13: First—he has spelled many words in two different ways without having given a preference, each of which he has defined *precisely* or nearly alike, and these words have been spelled but *one* way in his *former* dictionaries, and in the dictionaries of Johnson, Walker, &c.: Secondly—he has, in using the words thus differently spelled in his text, in defining other words, spelled them sometimes with one orthography, and sometimes with the other: Thirdly—he has frequently spelled a word two different ways, and has given a preference; but he has as often in his definitions, used the orthography which he has *not* preferred as that which he *has* preferred: Fourthly—he has, in many instances, changed the orthography of a word, and inserted the former orthography, and has referred the reader to the *new* spelling; but he has changed the orthography of other words without having given the former orthography, or any reference to it: Fifthly—he has many words that are spelled two different ways in his text, which he has coupled, sometimes even without reference to their alphabetical arrangements, so that the reader can see the different spelling of the *same* word at once; but he has other words differently spelled which are *not* thus coupled, which is a great inconvenience: Sixthly—he has, in his text, coupled many words which he has spelled in two different ways with one first in its alphabetical arrangement, and in another place the *other* word first, agreeably to the alphabetical arrangement of *that* word, in this manner, alternately giving each word, thus coupled, a preference by placing it first!

As examples have been given under each of the preceding classes on pages 14 and 15, the reader is referred to them on those pages.

All of the *defects* pointed out on page 14, contained in the quarto, are generally the *same* in the octavo. The *defects* shown on page 15, contained in the quarto, are generally the *same* in the octavo. In defining the words feather, leather, steady, &c. he has *not* used these words without *a*, as in the quarto! The same may be said of the word *sovereign*, which is not spelled *suveran* in the definitions of the octavo, as in the quarto! He has *not* coupled the words *chemist* and *chimist*, *chemistry* and *chimistry*, &c. in the quarto, but has in the octavo, the same with regard to *sovereign* and *suveran!* In the quarto he has spelled chimistry with *i* in the first syllable, and has given this orthography the preference; and, he has also a note in the quarto in which he shows that this word should be spelled with *i*,

and he has thus spelled the word chimistry and its derivatives *fifteen* times in the definitions of the same words, but in the octavo he has spelled chemistry and its derivatives with *e*, and has given the words the full definitions after this orthography; and, he has also spelled the word chemistry and its derivatives with *e* in the definitions in the octavo, *contrary* to the quarto in *all* cases! Thus the words appear in the quarto and in the octavo:

Quarto.		*Octavo.*	
Chimical	*Full definitions.*	Chemical	*Full definitions.*
Chimically		Chemically	
Chimist		Chemist	
Chimistry		Chemistry	
		Chimistry	
Chemical (see *chimical*)		Chimical	
		Chemical	

Quarto.	*Octavo.*
Chemically (see *chimically*)	Chimically, Chemically
Chemist (see *chimist*)	Chimist, Chemist
Chemistry (see *chimistry*)	Chimistry, Chemistry

See CHEMISTRY.

Quarto.	*Octavo.*
Alchimic	Alchemic
Alchimical	Alchemical
Alchimically	Alchemically
Alchimist	Alchemist
Alchimistic	Alchemistic
Alchimistical	Alchemistical
Alchimy	Alchemy

From an examination of the preceding list, we shall perceive that he has given *i* the preference both in the *text* and *definitions* of the quarto; and, that he has given *e* the preference in this class of words in the *text* and *definitions* of the octavo in *all* cases! In the first edition of the octavo, (1829) he spelled alchimy and its derivatives with *i*, but in this edition, (1831) he has changed them to *e*, to agree with chemistry! Was this done by Mr. Webster's consent? If so, why has he alchimy and its derivatives with *i* in the duodecimo dictionary, bearing the same date, 1831?

He has spelled *plow* and its derivatives with *w* in the quarto, but *plough* and its derivatives with *ough* in the octavo: thus—

Quarto.	*Octavo.*
Plow (*n.* & *v.*)	Plough, Plow (*n.*); Plough (*v.*)
Plow-alms	Plough-alms
Plow-bote	Plough-bote
Plow-boy	Plough-boy
Plowed	Ploughed
Plower	Plougher

Quarto.	*Octavo.*
Plowing (*ppr.*)	Ploughing (*ppr.*)
Plowing (*n.*)	Ploughing (*n.*)
Plow-land	Plough-land
Plow-man	Plough-man
Plow-monday	Plough-monday
Plow-share	Plough-share
Unplowed	Unploughed
Drillplow	Drillplough

In this class of words there are the most glaring *contradictions* that can possibly exist in a dictionary; *ow* is preferred in *all* cases in the text of the quarto, and *ough* in *all* cases in the text of the octavo! And yet we are told by Mr. Webster that "one very important object of this series of books, is to reduce to *uniformity*, the orthography of a great number of words which are differently written by different authors." In the quarto, *plow* is spelled with *ow* in the definitions; but in the octavo it is sometimes with *ow* and sometimes with *ough*; as under plough and its derivatives it is spelled with *ough*, but under *break* it is spelled with *ow!* He has "*unplowed*, not *plowed*" in the quarto, and "*unploughed*, not *ploughed*" in the octavo! although under break it is *unplowed* with *ow!*

He has, in the quarto, spelled *furlow* with *ow*, and has given the following note in support of his *new* orthography: "the common orthography *furlough* is corrupt, as the last syllable exhibits false radical consonants. The true orthography is *furlow*;" and he has spelled it *furlow* in the definitions in the quarto; but in the octavo he has spelled it both ways, and has given *ough* the preference both in the text and definitions! Thus—

Quarto.	*Octavo.*
Furlow (*n.*) *leave of absence.*	Furlough, Furlow (*n. leave of absence.*)
Furlow (*v.*) *to furnish with a furlow.*	Furlough, Furlow (*v. to furnish with a furlough.*)

In the quarto he has spelled *bridegoom* without *r*, in the last syllable, and has said of the former orthography, *bridegroom*, "such a gross corruption or blunder ought not to remain a reproach to philology;" yet in the octavo the word is changed back to the orthography of Walker and Johnson, *contrary* to the quarto and the preceding note, so that bridegoom, *without r in the last syllable*, does not appear in the text or definitions of the octavo at all!

He has, in the quarto, spelled *ribin* with single *b*, and *in*; but in the octavo he has spelled it *three* ways! and he has given *ribbon* the preference, both in the *text* and in the *definitions* of the octavo! Thus, in defining *ribin* and its derivatives, and in defining the word millinery, he has, in the quarto, spelled it in *all* cases *ribin*, but in the octavo *ribbon* in the *same* situation! The words appear in the following manner, in the two dictionaries:

Quarto.	*Octavo.*
Ribin (*n.*)	Riband, (*See* RIBBON.)
	Ribbon, } *n.*
	Ribin, }
Ribin, (*v. to adorn with ribins!*)	Ribbon, (*v. to adorn with ribbons!*)

In the quarto he has spelled *drouth* with *th* as the preferable orthography, and has given the following note: "This is usually written *drought*, after the Belgic dialect; but improperly;" but in the octavo *drought* is placed first as the preferable orthography in that dictionary! thus—

Quarto.	*Octavo.*	*Quarto.*	*Octavo.*
Drouth,	Drought, }	Drouthiness,	Droughtiness, }
	Drouth }		Drouthiness, }
		Drouthy,	Droughty, }
			Drouthy. }

He has in the quarto, spelled *Melasses* with *e* in the first syllable; and has said "MOLASSES, an incorrect orthography of *MELASSES*;" but in the octavo he has given molasses the preference by placing it first in the text, and has *not* given melasses in its place agreeable to alphabetical arrangement!

In the quarto, he has spelled *porpess* with *ess* in the last syllable, and has not given any reference to the former orthography *porpoise*; but in the octavo he has spelled it *three* ways *porpoise*, *porpus*, *porpess*, *vise*, *us*, and *ess*, and has given *porpoise* the preference by placing it first, and *porpess*, the orthography of the quarto, last!!! And yet he says on page 13 of his pamphlet, recently published; "*Porpoise* is a mere blunder!" In the quarto, he has spelled *nightmar* without final *e*, but in the octavo he has spelled it *nightmare* and *nightmar*, with *e* and without it, and has given with *e* the preference; and, in the quarto, he has also in defining incubus spelled *nightmar* without *e*, but in the octavo with it!

He has, in the quarto, spelled *hagard*, when an adjective and noun with one *g*, and *hagardly* with one *g* also, and in defining *hagardly* he has *hagard* with one *g*; but, in the octavo, he has spelled *haggard*, noun and adjective, and *haggardly*, with *gg*; and, also in defining *haggardly*, he has spelled *haggard* with *gg*!

Nearly all the *discrepances* in the *text* and *definitions* of the quarto, pointed out on pages 16, 17 and 18, remain the same in the octavo. Perhaps *one hundred* of the *eight hundred* "*are corrected*" in the octavo, mostly, however, by changing the orthography in the *text* of the octavo, and making it agreeable to the orthography of Walker and Johnson!

The limits of this review will not permit me to pursue the exposition of the *contradictions* in orthography between Webster's quarto and octavo dictionaries. The *critical* reader who wishes to know more of the "uniformity" of Mr. Webster's works, can pursue the subject, and examine more *fully* and *minutely*. I think, however, that enough has been shown, to convince every *impartial* scholar of the *impropriety*, *injustice*, and *absurdity* of his condemnation of all *English* Dictionaries for want of "uniformity," when there are not in existence two *English* or *American* Dictionaries which *disagree* in orthography as much as Webster's quarto and octavo dictionaries disagree! And yet Mr. Webster has stated on page 1 of his pamphlet, published during the past year, that "one very important object of this series of books, (quarto, octavo, school dictionary, and Elementary Spelling Book,) is to reduce to *uniformity* the orthography of a great number of words which are *differently* written by *different* authors"!

With regard to the justness of these remarks by Mr. Webster, the candid publick must decide, after having read attentively and critically the preceding and following pages of this review.

REVIEW

OF

WEBSTER'S DUODECIMO DICTIONARY.

[*The copy, quoted in this Review, bears date* 1831.]

A FEW months after the publication of the octavo dictionary, Mr. Webster published "A Dictionary of the English Language: abridged from the American Dictionary, for the use of Primary Schools and the Counting-House."

In the preface to this (duodecimo) dictionary, page 2, in speaking of the orthography of the quarto and octavo dictionaries, he has stated, that "some errors in orthography escaped observation;" and farther remarks, "But the number of these I am not able to ascertain; as it is not probable that I shall ever again read the whole of the octavo or quarto edition. My intense and long continued labors render repose essential to my health and comfort, during the short period of life which remains." [And yet, Mr. Webster, after this appeal to the *sympathies* of the community, relative to the errors which had been discovered in his works, instead of seeking "*repose*," has travelled almost without cessation, making speeches in the different cities and large villages, *puffing* his new system of spelling, and, at the same time, *condemning* Johnson, Walker, and others; and has used every effort to make "proselytes," although he has stated in his pamphlet, page 8, that "*personal* application has been made by PEDDLING COMPILERS, to teachers and others, for the purpose of inducing them to lay aside my book (alluding to his Spelling-Book) and use their own"!] Again; he says, on page 2, "this duodecimo volume, my last work, all written and corrected by myself," [MYSELF?] (who else would write *Webster's* dictionary, but [MYSELF!] Mr. WEBSTER?) "is to be considered as containing the pointing, orthography, and pronunciation, which I [*I!*] most approve;" although on page 3, in the preface prefixed to the octavo dictionary, published *but six months* previous to the date of the preface from which the preceding extract is made, he stated, that "The *quarto* edition will, of course, be considered as presenting *his* EXACT *views of the* PROPER *arrangement and exhibition of words, in respect to their* ORTHOGRAPHY *and* PRONUNCIATION"!! Again, on page 1 of his pamphlet, published the past year, he has stated, that "one very important object of this series of books, (quarto, octavo, duodecimo, and Elementary Spelling-Book,) is to reduce to uniformity," thereby conveying the idea that these four books *are* "uniform" and *consistent* in their orthography!

I now propose to show that "this duodecimo volume, his last work, all written and corrected by himself," is no more to be consulted as a "STANDARD OF ORTHOGRAPHY," than the quarto and octavo dictionaries, the *contradictions*, *inconsistencies*, and *anomalies* of which I have already pointed out.

All the *contradictions* and *inconsistencies* in the orthography of the class of words which end with *ck*, except hassock, pointed out on page 8, contained in the quarto, *remain* in the duodecimo! The following *inconsistency*, contained both in the quarto and octavo, is still retained in the duodecimo. He has spelled *mimic*, when a noun, without *k*, and with it when a verb; yet he has made no such distinction in the words *frolick* and *traffick*, having spelled them with *k*, when a noun and verb! This *innovation* makes another "anomaly" in our language, that of *spelling* the noun and verb differently, when they are *pronounced* alike.

The orthography of the class of words which end with *er*, in the quarto, as the preferable orthography, pointed out on page 9, he has changed back to the orthography of the quarto, with *all* the *contradictions* pointed out on that page, with the *addition* of *six* or *seven* more! and has given the termination *er* the preference, *contrary* to the octavo, published six months previous! Thus, in the quarto, he has spelled fiber, luster, miter, ocher, and specter, but *one* way, with *er*; but in the duodecimo he has spelled them *two* ways, *er* and *re* both! The word belleslettres he has spelled with *re* in the quarto and octavo, but with *er* in the duodecimo!

In the duodecimo, he has *six* different ways of exhibiting the orthography of this class of words, which end with *er* or *re*. Thus, center; acre; amphitheater, [or *tre*]; fiber, fibre; luster, lustre; and scepter, [sceptre]!!! Quite a "uniformity" indeed, which is "a prime excellence in spelling." He condemns, in the introduction to his quarto, the termination *red* in sceptred, yet he has, in the text of the quarto, octavo, and duodecimo, spelled hungred with this termination, although hunger is spelled with the termination *er*!

The *class of words which end with ff* in the octavo, as the preferable orthography, he has *changed back to the orthography* of the quarto, with single *f*, with two or three additional

contradictions not in the quarto! Thus, he has spelled mastif and mastiff, with single *f* and *ff*! He has restif and restive, with *f* and *ive*! He has distaff with *ff*, but all of the other words end with single *f*! He has, after the words sherif and tarif, inserted [sheriff] and [tariff] with *ff*, in brackets; but he has not inserted the old orthography of any other words except [sheriff] and [tariff] in brackets, after the *new* orthography!

He has, in the duodecimo, spelled midriff with *ff*, contrary to his text in defining diaphragm. He has, in the duodecimo, all the inconsistencies in the class of words which end in *ance* and *ence*, pointed out on page 10; but he spelled entrance, (*verb*,) with *c*, *contrary* to the quarto, in the duodecimo of 1829!

In the orthography of the word *ache* and its compounds, he has not, in the duodecimo, as many *contradictions* as in the quarto, pointed out on page 10, for he has only *part* of the words. Thus, he has not bellyache or boneache in the duodecimo; but he has some *new* contradictions not in either the quarto or octavo! As, headache, headake; heartache, heartake, with *che* and *k* both; but toothache with *che* only! when headache and heartache are spelled but *one* way either in the quarto or octavo. Thus, he has these two words each spelled *three* ways, in his *three* dictionaries. [See pages 10 and 11.]

The *contradictions* in the orthography of the class of words which end in *l* or *ll*, pointed out on page 11, remain the same in the duodecimo, except that he has *added* to the number of them; thus, he has medalist with single *l*, and metallist with *ll*, *contradictory*, but both alike, with *ll*, in the quarto and octavo! In the quarto and octavo, he has spelled withal, therewithal, and wherewithal, with single *l*, but in the duodecimo, he has spelled withal with *ll*, *contrary* to the quarto and octavo, and therewithal and wherewithal with single *l*, *agreeing* with them! and the *l* should be doubled in *all* of them agreeably to his rule. Again, he has not doubled *l* in extol, "which must be doubled in the derivation" extolling, &c.; but has spelled it as Johnson and Walker have. He has, in the duodecimo, spelled brimfull with *ll*, *contrary* to the quarto and octavo, and handful with single *l*! A great many of the words pointed out on page 12, as *contradictory*, are not in the duodecimo; but in those which *are* inserted, the contradictions still exist; as, vizard with *z*, and unvisard with *s*! inthralled with *i*, and unenthralled with *e*! referee with single *r*, and transferee with *rr*! &c. &c. He has, in the duodecimo, apposit, appositly, and appositness, without *e*, and opposite, oppositely, and oppositeness, with *e*! but all of them have *e* in the quarto and octavo, so that this *contradiction* does not exist in either of them! He has, in the duodecimo, scurilous, scurilously, and scurilousness, with single *r*, but with *rr* in the quarto and octavo! He has berylline and coralline with *ll*, and crystaline with single *l*! He has kale with *k*, and seacale *c*! He has, in the duodecimo, spelled builder, bilder; building, bilding; and built, bilt, *two* ways, with *ui* and with *i* only, but in the quarto and octavo, *one* way, with *ui*! He has also spelled built, bilt, two ways, but airbuilt but one! In the duodecimo, he has spelled burden, disburden, and overburden, one way, with *d* only; but unburthen, unburden, with *th* and *d*, and has given *th* the preference! He has, in the duodecimo, torsion with *s*, and detortion with *t*! In the quarto, calice, without *h*, is the "preferable orthography;" although chaliced is spelled with *h*; but in the duodecimo chalice is spelled with *h* only! He has, in the quarto and octavo, spelled cumfrey, comfrey, and comfry, *three* ways, but in the duodecimo he has it but *one* way, comfry, the orthography the least preferred either in the quarto or octavo!! He has, in the duodecimo, spelled pierce *one* way, with *ie* only; but unpierced, unperced, with *ie* and *e* both, *contrary* to the quarto and octavo! He has, in the duodecimo, spelled unsteadfast, unstedfast, and its derivatives, *two* ways, with *ea* and *e* only, but in the quarto and octavo *one* way, *ea*! He has, in the duodecimo, spelled venturesome with *e* after the *r*, but adventursome without *e*! In the duodecimo, he has burg without *h*, and burgher with it! He has accruing without *e*, and rueing with it! He has bullfinch with *ll*, and bulrush with single *l*, and the *u* preceding the *l* has the same sound in each. In the quarto and octavo, he has given villany, without *i*, the preference, and has spelled archvillany without *i*; but in the duodecimo he has spelled villainy with *i*! In the duodecimo, he has changed the orthography of chemistry and its derivatives, back to the quarto, *contrary* to the octavo!

Octavo.	*Duodecimo.*	*Octavo.*	*Duodecimo.*
Chemistry	Chimistry	Alchemical	Alchimical
Chemical	Chimical	Alchemically	Alchimically
Chemically	Chimically	Alchemist	Alchimist
Chemist	Chimist	Alchemistic	Alchimistic
Alchemic	Alchimic	Alchemistical	Alchimistical
		Alchemy	Alchimy!

He has, in the duodecimo, changed the orthography of plough and its derivatives, back to the quarto, *contrary* to the octavo!

Octavo.	*Duodecimo.*	*Octavo.*	*Duodecimo.*
Plough	Plow	Ploughman	Plowman
Ploughing	Plowing	Ploughshare	Plowshare
Ploughed	Plowed	Drillplough	Drillplow
Ploughland	Plowland	Unploughed	Unplowed

In the duodecimo, he has spelled furlow with *ow*, *contrary* to the octavo, in which it is furlough! He has, in the duodecimo, spelled bridegoom without *r* in the last syllable, agreeably to the quarto, but *contrary* to the octavo, as bridegoom, without *r* in the last syllable, does not appear either in the text or definitions of the octavo! He has, in the duodecimo, changed the orthography of ribin, back to the quarto, *contrary* to the octavo! In the duodecimo, he has spelled melasses with *e*, *contrary* to the octavo, in which molasses is given as the preferable orthography. In the octavo, he has given porpoise the preference, but in the duodecimo, he has it porpess! In the duodecimo, he has nightmar without final *e*, but in the octavo with *e*, as the preferable orthography. He has, in the duodecimo, changed the orthography of hagard and hagardly, back to the quarto, contrary to the octavo! He has *l* single in although, always, and jackal, in which the *a* is broad, and the *l* should be doubled agreeably to his rule, "that single *l* would lead to a false pronunciation!" He has in the duodecimo, apposit without final *e*, and inapposite with it, *contrary* to the quarto and octavo! In the duodecimo, he has gazetteer with *tt*, and garreteer with single *t*! He has in the duodecimo, foliaceous with *eous*, and extrafoliacious with *ious*! He has diphylous with single *l*, and hexaphyllous with *ll*! He has in the duodecimo, lunge with *u*, and allonge with *o*! In the duodecimo he has pinnate with *i*, bipennate with *e*, and tripennate, tripinnate with *e* and *i* both! In the duodecimo, he has gillyflower with *y*, and clovegilliflower with *i*! He has clanish and clanishness with single *n*, *contrary* to the rule of spelling derivative words, which is, that a consonant that ends a monosyllable or a word accented on the last syllable, preceded by a single vowel, should be doubled, when a syllable is added beginning with a vowel, as span, spanning, &c. In the duodecimo, he has turkey, turky, with *ey* and *y* both, but all the other words of this class, as jockey, lackey, &c., he has spelled but one way! He has, in the duodecimo, spelled stead, sted, with *ea* and *e*, both ways, but instead *one* way, *ea*!

On page 13, I have pointed out what qualities a dictionary should possess in an eminent degree, if intended to be a "Standard of Orthography." This duodecimo dictionary is as *defective* as either the quarto or octavo, particularly as he has exhibited a greater *want of decision* in giving the orthography of each word than in them. Thus, he has all the varieties of spelling the different words, pointed out on pages 14, 15, and 16, as, apostrophe, apostrophy; epitome, epitomy; enlist, inlist; entwine, intwine, &c. &c. He has, in the quarto, spelled proceed, procede; succeed, succede; and exceed three *different* ways; but in the duodecimo he has changed them back to the orthography of Johnson and Walker, all with *eed*! In the duodecimo, he has, in the orthography of the words which end in *aunt*, a great many *contradictions*. Thus, he has daunt and taunt *one* way, but flaunt, flant; haunt, hant; and vaunt, vant, *two* ways! Again; although he has given these three words *two* ways, he has given vaunting, vanting, *two* ways; flaunting but *one* way and the participle haunting is not inserted at all! He has, in the duodecimo, strow strowed; strew, strewing, strewed, without having given any preference! He has, in the duodecimo, spelled craunch, cranch; haunch, hanch, *two* ways, and stanch but *one* way In the duodecimo, he has Czar, Tzar; Czarina, Tzarina with *Cz* and *Tz*! He has no *decision* at all in his orthography; for instance, he says in the quarto, that wiry is preferable to wiery, yet he has placed wiery first in the duodecimo! He says in his new Spelling-Book, page 137, that many words which are spelled with *ea* should be with *e* only; but in his duodecimo dictionary he has some of them with *one* spelling, others with *two*; as, spread, spred; tread; stead, sted, &c. &c.; he has also some of the participles with *one* spelling, others with *two*; as, spreading, spredding, treading, &c. He has sovereign and suveran, both ways, in the duodecimo, without having given a preference! The *contradictions* pointed out on pages 16, 17, and 18, between the definitions and text in orthography, are not as numerous in the duodecimo as in the octavo and quarto, as most of the definitions are changed and abbreviated, yet the greater part of them which are inserted, remain *contradictory*, as, holiday under ferial; faggot under dunnage; entrust under confident; ensnare under catch; intreat under obsecrate; intreaty under obsecration; halbert under glair; stupify under dull, &c. &c. Again; he has in the duodecimo, in defining ancony, spelled bloomery, *contrary* to his text, blomary; in defining travesty he has spelled burlesk with *k*, which is not the orthography that he has preferred in his text! In the duodecimo, the definitions of the words subtile and subtle are confounded. In the duodecimo, he has, in defining nauseous and nauseousness, spelled lothesome with *e*, *contrary* to his text lothsome! &c. &c.

It is very improper and perplexing to exhibit *two* different spellings of the same word; for, the scholar will always hesitate in spelling it, sometimes using one orthography, sometimes the other; as vaunt and vant, unburthen and unburden, steril and sterile, &c. &c.; yet Mr. Webster has, in his duodecimo, not only given two different spellings of the same word, when coupled together, as vaunt, vant, haunch, hanch, &c.; but he has given two different spellings of the same word, when *not* coupled, with the *same* or *similar* definitions! Thus, sovereign (*a.*) supreme in power; suveran, (*a.*) supreme in power, chief: sovereign (*n.*) a supreme ruler; suveran (*n.*) a supreme lord or ruler: sovereignty, supremacy, supreme dominion; suveranty, supreme power, supremacy: ache, to be in pain; akc, to be in *continued pain*! vant, vaunt, to boast, to brag; vaunt, vant, to boast, to brag! enlistment, an

of enlisting; inlistment, act of inlisting! engrained, dyed in the grain; ingrained, dyed in the grain! encase, to inclose in a case; incase, to inclose in a case! encage, to confine in a cage; incage, to confine in a cage! &c. &c. &c. His system can not be *complete*, unless he shall give *all* the different spellings of the *same* word in each of his *four* books, viz. Quarto, Octavo, Duodecimo, and his new Spelling-Book; as steril, sterile; vaunt, vant, &c. &c.

Mr. Webster's duodecimo dictionary is very deficient in one important particular. Many words in common use are not contained in it; as, achor, ambitious, are, asseverate, benignant, bruit, cantharides, capias, chronometer, composite, dictation, discrepancy, discrepant, execution, suspire, fascine, indign, logarithms, observatory, stupidity, &c. &c. *all* of which, except discrepancy and execution, are in his new Spelling-Book! and there are numerous other words, not above enumerated, contained in his new Spelling-Book, which are not in the duodecimo dictionary, "for the use of PRIMARY SCHOOLS!!" [See page 38.] On page 131 of his new Spelling-Book, he has, in the second column, *seven* words, only *one* of which is in his duodecimo school dictionary! As this review is limited to the *orthography* of the language, no particular notice will be taken of the CONTRADICTIONS *in pronunciation* which exist between the octavo and duodecimo dictionaries. These are more numerous than even the *contradictions* in orthography, particularly in the division of words. Thus, in the

Octavo.	*Duodecimo.*	*Octavo.*	*Duodecimo.*
Ax-iom	Ax-i-om	Ev-er-y	Ev-e-ry
Aux-il-ia-ry	Aux-il-i-a-ry	Gen-er-al	Gen-e-ral
Bagn-io	Bag-nio	Gen-er-ous	Gen-e-rous
Do-mes-ti-cate	Do-mes-tic-ate.	Com-i-cal	Com-ic-al

He has, in the quarto and duodecimo, given the *short* broad sound in fault, default, assault, &c., and the *long* broad sound in the octavo! Again; he has a great many *contradictions*, in the duodecimo, in the division of words of similar or precisely the same form or termination. Thus,

Anx-i-ous and	Over-anx-ious	Pest-i-len-tial	An-ti-pes-ti-len-tial
Nox-ious	In-nox-i-ous	In-cum-bent	Su-per-in-cumb-ent
Car-riage	Wheel-car-ri-age	Crus-ta-ceous	Trut-ta-ce-ous
Win-dow	Dor-mar-wind-ow	Le-gion	Re-gi-on
Fe-brile	An-ti-feb-rile	Li-tig-i-ous	Pro-dig-ious, &c. &c.

The *contradictions* in division are so numerous, that the limits of this review will not permit me to point out one *twentieth* part of them. He has, in the pronunciation, in the quarto, octavo, and duodecimo, changed a great many words to that of *Walker*, contrary to his former dictionaries and Spelling-Book; as angel, danger, are, folio, convenient, &c. &c. although he has said that Walker's pronunciation is not heard in "any *decent* society in England"!! The keys in the different dictionaries are different, which create some perplexity; for instance, attorney in the octavo, and attorney in the duodecimo, &c. &c.

Again; he is not consistent or uniform in noting the silent letters by printing them in Italick in all cases, when silent, in the duodecimo; as, rece*i*pt with *p* Italick, contempt with *p* Roman! often with *t* Roman, and so*f*ten with *t* Italick! moi*s*ten with *t* Italick, and gli*s*ten with *t* Roman, when *all* of them have *t* silent, agreeably to his new Spelling-Book, page 140! &c. &c.

Mr. Webster has, in the introduction to the quarto, in page 3 of the duodecimo, and page 11 of his pamphlet, published during the past year, spelled enthrall with *e*, *contrary* to the text of *all* his dictionaries, in which it is spelled with *i*! In short, to point out *all* the *contradictions*, *inconsistencies*, and *anomalies*, in orthography, pronunciation, accent, and division of words, which exist in the quarto, octavo, and duodecimo, would require a book as large as the duodecimo dictionary itself; and I must therefore be content with having pointed out a part of each, that the reader may have a clew or index to them, and examine them at his leisure.

REVIEW

OF

MR. WEBSTER'S AMERICAN SPELLING-BOOK.

FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE ALBANY ARGUS, IN 1827—8.

As the publishers of Mr. *Webster's* new *Elementary* Spelling-Book, compiled by AARON ELY, have reserved to themselves the right to publish either the *old* or the *new* Spelling-Book, as should best suit their interests,* I have concluded to insert the review of the *old* Spelling-Book which was published in the Albany Argus, except that part which particularly relates to Mr. Webster's innovations in the orthography of his *old* Spelling-Book, and Dictionaries published in 1806 and 1817. For this part of that review, the reader is referred to pages 7, 8, 9 and 10 of this Review, in which the impropriety of those innovations is taken into consideration.

Mr. Webster's spelling-book was founded upon, and succeeded Dilworth's. It was so superiour to its predecessor, in many respects, as to acquire an immediate and unparalleled popularity, which it has sustained with little interruption for more than *forty years*. So magical indeed has been the charm of popularity woven around it, that all desire for, or efforts to improvement, seem to have been paralyzed; and it is not until within a few years, that any successful attempts have been made to improve upon this popular system. The merits of Mr. Webster's book have been duly considered by me; and while I would award to him the just meed of praise for timely efforts in the cause of education, I am not disposed to deny, that, since our systems of instruction have undergone much change, and the elements of our language have been more closely investigated and more clearly defined, useful improvements in the department in which Mr. Webster was so successful may be made, if they be not, in fact, from circumstances and the spirit of the age, absolutely required. Great caution is necessary, however, that the laudable spirit of improvement, and the love of variety and change, should not be imposed upon by speculators and pretenders; and that a work, entitled to respect for the good which it has hitherto been instrumental in effecting, should not be driven from the publick confidence, except by one of equal or superiour merits.

First—as the guiding principles of my investigation, I will state the leading characteristicks of such a Spelling-Book as I should deem worthy of a general introduction into our primary schools.

1. It should contain as great a number of the words in common use as practicable, to the exclusion of extraneous and irrelevant matter; as many who attend our primary schools have no other opportunity of acquiring a correct knowledge of the elements of our language.

2. The *classification* of words should be judicious and distinct; and the system adopted be strictly and correctly adhered to.

3. The *arrangement* should be plain and simple, with a due regard to the expanding capacities and the progressive improvement of the learner.

4. In *orthography* and *orthoepy* it should correspond with the standard dictionary of the country; or strictly conform with the principles of the work it professes to follow: for the *dictionary*, and not the *spelling book*, must be the standard of reference: and hence the importance, for the uniformity and correctness of our language, that the latter work should be founded and carefully constructed upon the principles of the former.

CONTENTS.

Mr. Webster's spelling-book comprises 168 pages: 14 of which are introductory; 66 contain words taken from the dictionary: 29 pages contain the names of persons, places, &c.; 47 contain reading lessons: 8 contain pictures, and fables; and 4 pages contain numbers, abbreviations, explanations of the characters used in writing, and a census of the United States.

Thus we find that 18 pages *less than half* of Mr. Webster's spelling-book, are devoted to the insertion of spelling lessons, containing words of our language to the number of 6950, including the examples of the formation of plurals, derivative and compound words to the number of 1150, so that there are only 5800 words of the language in his book arranged *expressly* for spelling, with the pronunciation noted; of these 5800 words, 220 are inserted more than once in the different spelling lessons, not including those subject to different accentuation when differently applied; as, page 19, *spike* and *spike;* 18 and 19, *ape, ride, wide;* 19 and 36, *hence, pence, fence, fetch, rinse, brick, stick, kick;* page 30 and 31, *adversity;* page 32, and 33, *slay;* page 23 and 51 *abase;* page 66 and 67, *admissible;* page 35 and 146, *course, coarse, know, hew, new;* 18 and 148, *sale, vale,* &c. &c. Mr. Webster's spelling lessons are also *quite deficient* inasmuch as he has not, in any of them, inserted any words of *four* syllables accented on the *fourth*, as *superintend, multiplicand,* &c.; words of five syllables accented on the *fourth*, as *administrator, superintendent,* &c.; words of six or seven syllables with their different accentuation, as *supernumerary, illegitimacy, indefatigable, superiority, encyclopedia, impracticability,* &c. Again, Mr. Webster omitted a great many words in most common use; as, abhorrence, abridge, absorb, abstain, abundance, academy, access, accord, accost, accuse, acquirement, achieve, acute, adapt, adopt, adult, advancement, adverb, advice, affect, agent, aggress, agree, ague, alledge, allegation, allegiance, alley, alphabet, ambush, analyze, angle, animate, annul, anvil, appeal, apple, argue, armour, article, assault, assemble, assist, assistance, associate, atmosphere, attain, attract, attribute, austere, avail, avarice, average, averse, avow, await, award, axis, axle, &c. &c. throughout the whole language, a great portion of the most common words was *entirely omitted*, by Mr. Webster, in the spelling lessons of his *old* Spelling Book!

The omission of these words is a very great *defect*, as most of them are very important words, and in general use; these classes of words *were inserted* in the spelling-books of Dilworth and Perry. In consequence of the fewness of words in Mr. Webster's spelling-book, those scholars who use it cannot become acquainted with one half of the words in common use, either in their orthography or pronunciation; and consequently the scholar will find words in almost every sentence of his reading lessons, with the orthography or pronunciation of which he is wholly unacquainted, not having seen them in his spelling lessons of the same book.

And again; there are a great many words in the spelling lessons of his Spelling-Book which are not in his dictionary published in 1817, "compiled for the use of common schools in the United States," of course *intended* to be used with *his* Spelling-Book, containing these words! and some of these are *not even* in his "*Compendious* Dictionary," published in 1806!

Those in italick are not in the "compendious dictionary:" Acanthus, annunciate, *antibacchus*. apostolical. *apropos* astrological, *beal*, bedchamber, belleslettres, *belove*, bibliothecal, bodge, botany, cachexy, cantharides, *cantherus*, *cantharis*, capuchin, carle, catechumen, caught, chamade, chamois, chancre, *chaw*, cheveril, chevisance, chirography, chevauxdefrise, chorography, chromatic, chronometer, clomb, cogger, *cogitate*, cognizor, cognizee, conclu-

* It may not be improper to state here, that in consequence of the publication of this review in the Albany Argus, Mr. Webster abandoned his *old* Spelling-Book, and employed Mr. Aaron Ely to compile a *new* one, which was published more than *two years* before the copy-right of the *old* Spelling-Book expired, (Sept. 15, 1831,) and every effort was made to push it into use. That Mr. Webster would *not* have published a *new* Spelling-Book, had not the criticisms in the Albany Argus been given to the publick, is, I think fairly to be inferred from the two following statements made by him in his APPEAL "TO THE PUBLICK," published in New Haven, March, 1828.

Thus Mr. Webster remarked, "My tables, especially those of irregular words, the most important of all the classes, are so constructed, *and so nearly complete*, THAT THEY CANNOT BE IMPROVED." And he remarks farther "My Spelling-Book, which has had an unparalleled sale, and has, it is *believed*, had a very extensive effect in facilitating the acquisition of the language and in preserving the popular *pronunciation from vulgarities*—WILL BE ADJUSTED (not that he would write or cause to be written a new one) to a *uniformity with the dictionary in pronunciation*." The preceding remarks, it must be recollected, were published but eighteen months *previous to the publication of the criticism in the Argus.*

sive, customary, *decrial*, *disconcern*, *dost*, *doth*, dungeon, *entendre*, *epidemical*, *examen*, *flook*, *foreseen*, fraicheur, (contrary to his spelling-book,) *fream*, *forsworn*, *froze*, gibber, gilt, *grown*, *grew*, *has*, *hast*, *hath*, *heard*, *him*, *himself*, *his*, hithe, *iambus*, imprudent, *jagged*, kern, knaggy, *knew*, *known*, laid, kiln, legged, *lieve*, lithography, logarithms, *longer*, *longest*, *macilent*, made, mathesis, meathe, *meant*, mendacity, mice, *miserableness*, merdacity, *mown*, nugacity, *ochimy*, omnigenous, (contrary to his spelling-book,) orgillous, *overwhelming*, paid, *paradigm*, *pedagogical*, *perspiratory*, *perspicacity*, plinth, plethory, *polge*, *preparatory*, procacious, *pyrrhichius*, quern, raker, ran, rath, reeve, rhomb, riggish, *risen*, rode, roquelaure, (contrary to spelling-book,) runnion, *saxon*, *says*, sequacity, shaw, sigil, sought, *sworn*, spilth, spondee, stadtholder, *squeal*, staid, stile, stirp, *stronger*, syncope, synecdoche, synthesis, *synthetic*, tarzue, taught, tew, thane, theomachy, theodolite, thirl, threw, throve, took, tost, *tribacchus*, triplicity, trochee, urethra, *vegetant*, vert, waif, wages, wast, wherret, whitster, &c.

CLASSIFICATION.

In the classification and arrangement of words for spelling lessons, Mr. Webster's book was, unquestionably, far superiour to Dilworth's. Mr. Dilworth's classification and arrangement merely consisted in arranging and classing the monosyllables according to the number of letters contained in each word, whether vowels or consonants; and the words of more than one syllable according to their peculiar accentuation only: whereas, Mr. Webster not only arranged the words according to their peculiar accentuation, but classed them agreeably to their particular vowel or consonant sounds; as long *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, *w*, and *y*; short *a*, *e*, *i*, *u*, and *y*; flat *a*; broad *a*; *e*, *i* and *o*, when sounded like *u* short, &c.: the designation or classification of the different sounds of *th*; the classification of the words in which *c*, *t* and *s* are sounded like *sh*; *oe* like *o* long; *s* and *z* like *zh*; *i* like *y*; the different sounds of *ch*; as, *ch* like *k* and *sh*; *g* hard before *e*, *i*, and *y*; *g* double in the pronunciation, though single in the orthography; *c* and *g* pronounced like *s* and *j* at the end of syllables; *w* sounded after *h*, though written before it; *x* sounded like *gz* when followed by an accented syllable beginning with a vowel or *h*; irregular words not comprised in the foregoing tables; and words of the same sound, but different in spelling and signification.

I shall now attempt to show in the first place what I consider defects in his classification, and in the second place, the defective arrangement of the words thus defectively classed. Table 2, and 3, containing the first monosyllables in which the scholar must be exercised after learning the alphabet, contain many words in which double vowels and consonants are exhibited; as *ll* in *call*, *fill*, *ss* in *bless*, *gg* in *egg*, *bb* in *ebb*, *ee* in *bleed*, &c. *s* like *z* as in *has*, *nose*, *spasm*; *e* silent in *hence*, *mince*; *ck* in *brick*; *tch* in *match*; and a large number of words in the plural form in which *s* is sounded like *z*; all of which render these tables the most difficult for the scholar of any in the book, considering his capacity when introduced to them. Table 2, 3, and 12, contain many words which are spelled differently, though pronounced alike, which causes great perplexity. This, however, will be taken notice of more particularly when I shall review Table 53. The objections which I have preferred against Tables 2 and 3, are, in some degree, applicable to Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11; though the most prominent objection appears to be this, that they do not contain a sufficient number of easy words for the scholar's exercise, previous to his introduction to Table 12, and the Tables 14, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 28, which are composed of words of more difficult orthography and pronunciation. Of these tables I shall take particular notice hereafter, in treating of orthography and pronunciation. In the last part of Table 12, and in Table 37, the different sounds of *th* are exhibited, yet he has inserted *hath* and *thump* in Table 2, where they should not be agreeably to his system of classification, and again in Table 12; Tables 30, 34, and 35 comprise words in which *c*, *s* and *t* have the sound of *sh*: in these lessons the terminations *sion*, *tion*, *cial*, *cian*, *cious*, *tious*, *ciate*, and *tiate*, are intermingled in such a manner that the scholar cannot determine, when required to spell any word contained in these lessons, whether to use *c*, *t* or *s*, the sound being the same; as *pension*, *mention*, *suspicion*, &c.: and it appears evident that the words in which *t*, *c* and *s* have the sound of *sh*, should be classed in separate lessons, for the same reasons that he has classed the words in which *ch* has the sound of *sh* and *k*; as we learn their *pronunciation* by association, so should we learn the *orthography* of the other words referred to. Pages 47, and 71, he has *censure* and *sensuality* instead of placing them in the lesson where *s* has the sound of *sh*, neither has he told us in his book that *s* has the sound of *sh*, in these words. Table 32 he has a class of words ending in *ow* unaccented, and on p. 47, he has *bellows* where it should not be, and again in this lesson. On page 59 he has *usury*, and 63 he has *misprision*, instead of inserting them in Table 33, in which *s* has the sound of *zh*, where they should be. In Table 36, he says, *i* before a vowel sounds like *y* at the beginning of words; and contradicts his rule in the third word by pronouncing *soldier* *sol-ger*, and in the same column *anxious*, *ank-shus*! Should not these words have been placed in Table 47, with the irregular words? And farther, if *xio* have the sound of *kshu* in *anxious*, as he has given it, should they not in *connexion*, *defluxion*, *flexion*, *fluxion*, have the same sound, although he has not so pronounced them? On page 27 is *harpsichord*, page 61 *architect*, page 73 *christian*, instead of placing them in Table 28, in which *ch* have the sound of *k*; and on page 14, of the analysis, he says, "*ch* have the English sound as in *charm*; except in the 38th and 39th Tables:" consequently, we must, agreeably to the above rule, and his arrangement, pronounce them *harpsetshord*, *artshetekt*, *tshristshan*. Table 40 is composed of words in which *g* is hard before *e*, *i*, and *y*; and we might, therefore, reasonably expect that all of the words of this class would be given in this lesson only; yet we find on page 34, *geese*, page 17, *get* and *gig*, page 19, *gift*, page 40, *girt*, and again, in this lesson; and on page 17, *gilt*, page 24, *misgive*, page 28, *beginning*, where they should not be agreeably to his classification, and which are not in this lesson at all. At the close of Table 40, he has given 12 words which he says are pronounced as though they were written with double *g*; and instead of inserting all of the words of this class in this lesson as he should agreeably to his system of classification, he has intermixed 15 words in the preceding lessons of this class, which ought to have been in this lesson; as, page 23, *congress*, page 26, *singular*, page 28, *distinguish*, page 47, *dangle*, *gingle*, *language*, *languor*, *mangle*, *mingle*, page 48, *single*, *spangle*, *tangle*, *wrangle*, page 63, *entangle*, page 71, *singularity*; making more *not* classed than those he has classed. Should any one assert that these 15 words ought not to be classed with the 12 because the *g* is not followed by *e*, *i*, or *y*; let him answer why Mr. Webster classes *linguist* with the 12, as it is followed by *u*! In Table 43, *h* is pronounced before *w*, though written after it. At the close of this lesson he has *whore*, *whole*, *who*, *whom*, *whoop*, and *whose*, with the following note: "In the following, with their compounds and derivatives, *w* is silent." If the *w* be silent in these words, then it is not sounded *after* the *h*; why then are these words in this lesson? In Table 44, *x* has the sound of *gz*. Why are not *uxorious*, page 66, and *auxiliary*, page 91, in this lesson? See letter X, Webster's Analysis. Table 47 comprises irregular words not in the foregoing tables. Why are not *one*, page 39, *once*, page 40, *soldier* and *anxious*, page 91, *chamois*, page 97, inserted in this lesson, as they are irregular words, instead of being at the bottom of pages with references? Again, why were not those words which contain two different peculiar consonant sounds inserted with the irregular words also, for they do not *properly* belong in any other lesson, as only *one* peculiar sound is now noted: for instance; page 91 in the word *auxiliary* he has noted the sound of *i* like *y*, but he has not noted the sound of *x* like *gz*; p. 93 the sound of *th* is noted in *clothier*, but not the sound of *i* like *y*; p. 95 the sound of *ch* like *k* is noted in *chameleon*, but not the sound of *i* like *y*, &c. &c.

Table 53, page 145, contains "*words of the same sound but different in spelling and signification.*" As these words are taken from the dictionary, this lesson ought, undoubtedly, to have immediately succeeded table 47, page 112, instead of being placed *after* the names of persons, places, &c.; but Mr. Webster probably placed it in this manner in politeness to Mr. Dilworth, author of this lesson, who had it thus arranged.

This is one of the most important lessons contained in any spelling-book; for, unless these words are associated with their respective distinctive definitions, it is impossible for the scholar to become acquainted with their *orthography*, their *pronunciation* being alike. From the title of this lesson, and its evident importance in a spelling-book, we might reasonably expect it to contain all the common words of this class in the language; that none of these words should be inserted in the preceding lessons where the distinctive definitions are not given; that their pronunciation should be given in this lesson; and that no words should be here classed which are *not* pronounced alike; yet, this lesson (Table 53) is defective in all the above, and in some other particulars, as will be fully shown.

First; there are acknowledged by Mr. Webster, either in his spelling-book or dictionary, about *seven hundred and eighty* words of this class, yet he has classed in this lesson only *three hundred and two*, of which *he* says two or more are sounded alike, not *half* in the language. Secondly; there are 186 of these 302 intermingled in the preceding spelling lessons, where their distinctive definitions are not given, which, as a matter of prudence, ought not to be inserted *twice* to the exclusion of other words in common use: thirdly; there are in the preceding spelling lessons *one hundred and four* words, two of which are pronounced alike, but which are not classed in this table (53) neither can the scholar learn their distinctive definitions in any of Webster's spelling lessons; as cit sit, rap wrap, red read, (*e* short,) hall haul, dire dyer, mote moat, fore four, brake break, mule mewl, maze maize, day dey,

strait streight, praise prays, baise bays, tray trey, be bee, ye yea, seal ceil, shear shire (sheer not in the spelling-book,) tier tear, need, knead, seem seam, leaf lief, feet feat, reek wreak, mien mean; queen quean, reeve, reave, leave lieve, freeze frieze, high hie, clime climb, slow sloe, pole poll, boll bowl, hoar whore, known none, moan mown, holme home, slew slue, ark arc, bolt boult, last laste, hoop whoop, ooze ouse, tierce terse, verge virge, boy buoy, throw throe, with withe, weather wether, wheal wheel: Fourthly; there are also in the preceding lessons *fifty-seven* words each of which has another word corresponding in sound in Mr. Webster's dictionary, not one of which is in this table (53,) or in any other spelling lesson of his book, consequently the scholar cannot, from the use of Webster's spelling lessons, become acquainted with the orthography or distinctive definitions of the *fifty-seven* words corresponding in sound with these; as, but, wade, glare, time, holy, cruel, better, pencil, calendar, bay, day, hay, wall, wain, gauge, bait, gait, steak, kneel, peer, sear, seed, meal, wean, leach, beach, rhyme, stile, toll, pour, bloat, loan, port, hoard, flew, bruit, jamb, limb, wretch, knit, plum, ought, naught, wall, shock, tongue, rout, single, subtle, counsellor, session, anchor, pique, gild, rigger, whole, been: Fifthly; there are likewise about *one hundred* words of this class in Webster's dictionary, that is, two or more of which are sounded alike but spelled differently, not one of which is classed in table 53, neither are they in any other spelling lesson of Webster's spelling-book, consequently the scholar will never be taught their sound, orthography, or distinctive definitions from Webster's spelling lessons, neither will he even learn that there are such words in the language; as creek croak, goar gore, place plaice, bell belle, dam damn, marshal martial, chagrin shagreen, &c. &c.: Sixthly; as Mr. Webster has not given the pronunciation of the words in table 53, we cannot ascertain from his book how he intended a number of these classes should be pronounced; as, altar alter, ascent assent, canvass canvas, cell sell, century centaury, lesson lessen, metal mettle, pear pare, rest wrest, &c.; although he says at the head of this lesson "Words of the same sound," yet he has not given the pronunciation of *either* of the words of the preceding classes, in this or any other spelling lesson in his book! Seventhly; there is a number of classes in table 53, in which he has classed only *two* words of similar sound when there are *three* in his other spelling lessons, and in his Dictionary; as, by buy, pear pare, seen scene, sent scent, too two, vein vane, you yew; and not bye, pair, seine, cent, to, vain, and ewe: Eighthly; there is a number of words classed in this table as being sounded alike, which evidently are not, and should not be; as, centaury and century, chronical and chronicle, currant and current, principal and principle; and the five following words are not so spelled even in Webster's Dictionary; *bass* (in the sense here given,) *fellon, seignor, sl.oar,* and *vise:* Ninthly; many of the definitions of these words in table 53, are extremely *incorrect* and *awkward*, and at variance with the definitions of the same words in Webster's Dictionary; as *altar*, for sacrifice; *bier*, to carry the dead; *burrow*, for rabbits; *fane*, a weather cock; *grate*, for coals, &c. &c. for the definition of which, see Webster's Dictionary. For nearly all the defects in this lesson, Mr. Webster is, undoubtedly, very much indebted to Mr. Dilworth, as most of them had their origin in Dilworth's spelling-book.

Again; Mr. Webster's *classification* is *extremely defective* in another particular also; for, he has not taken notice of the words which are differently *accented* or *pronounced* as they are differently applied. He has not informed us at all in his spelling-book, that the same word is differently accented or pronounced in his spelling lessons, nor even told us that there are such words in the language! There are in the language, acknowledged by Mr. Webster in his Dictionary, *eighty* words subject to different accentuation, only *eighteen* of which are in the spelling lessons of his spelling-book, and these are intermingled in the different lessons without any regard to their classification or peculiar use in the language. For instance: he has but *four* of these words in any of his spelling lessons with the different accentuation noted; as *subject*, pages 23 and 25; *conduct*, pp. 23 and 24; *conjure*, pp. 24 and 49; *invalid* 28 and 28: the *fourteen* following words are inserted with only one accentuation noted; neither can we learn from his spelling-book that they ever should be differently accented: as convert, p. 23: confine, collect, gallant, impress, p. 24; project, protest, concert, p. 25; rebel p. 47; torment, transport, p. 48; desert, p. 52; compound, p. 53; precedent, p. 101; of the remaining 62 words of this class, which are of great importance to the scholar, he will for ever remain ignorant, unless he shall refer to some other source, than Webster's spelling-book, as absent, frequent, minute, retail, digest, export, import, record, prefix, produce, cement, accent, insult, extract, transfer, contest, contract, contrast, converse, object, attribute, august, &c. &c. are not in any of the spelling lessons of his book! Again; there are many words differently *pronounced* when differently applied, none of which are classed in his spelling-book. Some of these words are inserted and intermingled in the different spelling lessons with the different pronunciation; as tear pages 32 and 33; lead, p. 33 and 147; use, p. 35; mow, pp. 34 and 40; sow, 40 and 148; others are inserted with only one pronunciation noted in any of the lessons, neither can we learn from his spelling-book that they ever should be differently pronounced; put, page 17; wind, p. 18; close, p. 35; house, p. 40, abuse, p. 51, &c. but there are others of this class, which are not in any of his spelling lessons, as mouse, disuse, excuse, raven, tarry, diffuse, lower, &c. &c.

Although there are obvious defects in the *classification* of those consonant sounds which Mr. Webster *has* noted in his *analysis*, yet his spelling-book is still more defective, inasmuch as he has *not* noted or classed many particular consonant sounds, of which whole classes are indiscriminately interspersed through his spelling lessons. Of these I shall take notice when treating of his *Analysis* and pronunciation.

ARRANGEMENT.

It will no doubt be readily admitted, that next in importance to the proper *classification* of words intended for spelling lessons, containing the different and peculiar vowel and consonant sounds, is the due *arrangement* of the words thus classed, according to the ease or difficulty with which their orthography and pronunciation are learned.

Immediately succeeding the alphabet, are two tables containing monosyllables for the scholar's first exercise in spelling: and at the close of these are three lessons, containing "*Examples of the formation of the plural from the singular and of other derivatives.*" As these lessons contain many words in the singular form, with the orthography or pronunciation of which the scholar is yet unacquainted, these "examples" ought not to have been inserted here, more particularly as there are no figures over the columns to denote the vowel sounds as in other cases, nor is *s* in italick at the end of the plurals to denote its sound of *z*, as it should be generally. After these are tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, containing words of three and four syllables, with the different vowel sounds and accentuation noted; then table 12, containing monosyllables more difficult than the preceding, at the close of which is *another* lesson of "*Examples of the formation of plurals, and other derivatives.*" I cannot conceive why Mr. Webster inserted *two* lessons of this kind, more particularly as some of the words are in both! As in the other similar lesson, there are no figures to denote the vowel sounds, nor are silent letters noted by being printed in italick, as in other lessons, except the *w* in *bow, bows, owl* and *bowls!* Tables 14 and 15 contain words of two syllables, more difficult than the preceding; and table 17, contains "*Examples of words derived from their roots or primitives, plural nouns of two syllables,*" &c. Mr Webster has not given either rules, figures or italick letters to denote the pronunciation of these words; and, what renders this defect more perplexing, both to teacher and scholar, is, that a great part of these words is not in the other spelling lessons of his book where their *pronunciation* is given, or in Webster's Dictionary, consequently it cannot be learned from either! Tables 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 28, contain words of three, four and five syllables, in which the accentuation, vowel sounds, and silent letters are noted. The most prominent defects in these and the preceding tables, are in orthography and pronunciation, which will be taken notice of hereafter. Tables 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, and 44, contain words in which the peculiar consonant sounds are classed: *t* sounded like *tsh* and *sh*; *s* like *sh*; *ow* unaccented sounded like *o* long *s* and *z* sounded like *zh*; *c* and *t* like *sh*; *i* like *y*; the different sounds of *th*; *ch* like *k* and *sh*; *g* hard before *e*, *i* and *y*; *c* and *g* soft like *s* and *j* at the end of accented syllables; *h* pronounced before *w*, though written after it; and *x* pronounced like *gz*. I think it will appear evident to every candid mind, on examination, that these lessons are not all *arranged* with due regard to the ease of learning their orthography or pronunciation: for instance; the words in which *ow* have the sound of *o* long, table 32, are easier than those in which *t* has the sound of *tsh* and *sh*, and *s* the sound of *sh*, table 30: the words containing the different sounds of *th*, table 37, are easier than those in which *t* has the sound of *tsh* and *sh*, and *s* the sound of *sh*, table 30; *s* and *z* the sound of *zh*, table 33; *c* and *t* the sound of *sh*, tables 34 and 35; and *i* the sound of *y*, table 36: the words in which *g* is hard before *e*, *i* and *y*, table 40; *h* pronounced before *w* though written after it, table 43; and *x* pronounced like *gz*, table 44, are easier than those words in which *c*, *t* and *s* are pronounced like *sh*; *s* and *z* like *zh*; *ch* pronounced like *k*, table 38; and *ch* like *sh*, table 39; yet all the former of these tables above referred to, are placed *after* the latter. Table 46 consists of sixteen "*Examples of the formation of derivatives and compound words.*" As was stated with regard to table 17, Mr. Webster has given neither rules, figures nor italick letters to denote the pronunciation of these words; and, as not more than *one half of these* words are in the other spelling lessons where their pronunciation is noted, it cannot be learned from this book. At the close of this table, p. 111, is a class of "Compound Words." In this list are landtax, *Charlestown*, and *Georgetown*. If the above be compound words, why are not landlord, p. 47, and Jamestown, p

129, (and a number of similar words in the other lessons,) also called compound words, and classed with these! Tables 48, 49, 50 and 51, comprising 29 pages, contain the names of persons, places, rivers, lakes, &c. All of these words are here given without any classification, relative to the vowel or consonant sounds; and neither rules nor figures are given to denote their pronunciation. This defect in the classification and pronunciation of this large number of words, has caused great diversity in their pronunciation among teachers, and has greatly embarrassed them and their pupils. Thus we shall find, on examination, that of the lessons intended for spelling, *forty* pages contain words, to represent the pronunciation of which, Mr. Webster has not given any classification, figure or rules. Many of these words are spelled differently from the Geographies, Gazetteers, and Histories of the present day, as it seems evident that Mr. Webster has not paid much attention to their correction since he first published his spelling-book!

ORTHOGRAPHY.

I shall now take notice of the *orthography* of Mr. Webster's Spelling-Book; particularly as it regards a comparison of it with Mr. Webster's *Dictionaries*, published in 1806 and 1817, and Dilworth's Spelling-Book. As Mr. Webster has not, in his Spelling Book, *professed* to follow any particular Standard, but has published a dictionary himself since the first publication of his spelling book, to the orthography of which we might reasonably expect him to conform his spelling book; it will not, I presume, be considered injustice in me to show wherein the orthography of his spelling book and dictionary is at variance; and also to show that much of this erroneous spelling was evidently copied by Mr. Webster from Dilworth's spelling-book, as many of these words are spelled in Webster's spelling-book as they are in Dilworth's, contrary to Webster's dictionary. About twenty years or more after the first publication of his spelling-book, Mr. Webster published "A compendious Dictionary of the English Language." This was in the year 1806. In the year 1817, Mr. Webster published "A Dictionary of the English Language; compiled for the use of Common Schools in the United States." With these two dictionaries I have compared his spelling-book, and have found the following words spelled differently. The words in italicks are spelled in Dilworth's as in Webster's spelling-book, contrary to both of the editions of Webster's dictionary referred to. As, trissyllable p. 10; *chace* p. 18; *dyer*, *julep* p. 21; *jaggot*, *hansel*, *pannel*, *sailer*, *sallad* p. 22; *tailer*, *jocky*, spinet p. 23; *impale* p. 24; *offence*, *subtract* p. 25; ecstacy p. 26; empannel p. 28; epitome p. 30; apostacy p. 31; *calimanco* p. 32; baise, maize p. 33; doat, holme, shew, sluice p. 35; clench, niche, rince, *toult*, moult, crumb p. 36; staunch, laste, swash, fosse, *mosque*, launch, scoat p. 38; bourn, ouse croup, ton p. 39: ront, *grey*, skein, streight, sponge p. 40; thowl, thwak, loth p. 41; meethe, though, *seethe* p. 42; woe p. 44; gnoman or gnomon, heinous, *ancle* p. 46; *hindrance*, *phrenzy* p. 47; *satchel*, *cobler*, *frolic*, goslin p. 48; halloe, verjuice p. 49; finesse, quadrille p. 52; vultura, straight p. 56; enwrap p. 58; cimetar, definite p. 59; epaulette, hypocrite, jessamine, libertine, mackerel, paroxism p. 60; *almanac*, quarantine, roquelaur p. 61; achievment p. 63; malecontent p. 64; catastrophe, parishioner, apostrophe, chuse p. 67; vergaloo p. 70; commemmoration p. 75; encumber, thresh p. 77; benumb p. 78 and 167; ensnare, suitor, tipler p. 81; abscision p. 84; negociate p. 86; noviciate p. 88; laquey p. 89; behaviour, connexion punctillio p. 91; *enthral*, etherial p. 93; burthen, tether, carcase p. 94; *chotic*, alchymy, chamelion, chalibeate p. 95 bombasin, buccanier p. 97; twiggin, noggen, biggen p. 99; imagine p. 101; whurr p. 102; bailor, payor, methodize p. 109; batteau, women p. 112; avoirdupois p. 113; *bass* (*a* long) p. 145; *fellon* p. 146; *seignor*, *shoar*, *vise*, *poise* p. 148; *serf*, stile p. 150; molasses, cyder p. 154; beach (a tree) p. 155; recompence p. 160, &c.

In addition to the above, there is a number of words which are spelled differently in the different lessons of Webster's spelling-book, and are spelled in one manner only in his dictionary, as, page 18, dote 35 doat, page 18, chace 100 chase, page 19, rinse 36 rince, page 20, wo 44 woe, page 21, brier 92 briar, page 33, maize 155 maiz, page 40, streight, page 56, straight, pages 39, 50, 51, choose, 67, 68, chuse, page 48, frolic 107 frolick, page 91, connexion 96 connection, page 91, seignior 148 seignor, which is, undoubtedly, a very great defect.

I think it will appear evident to every person on the perusal of the preceding comparison, that the orthography of Mr. Webster's spelling-book is very *defective*, and that Mr. Webster has not paid that attention to the improvement and correction of his book, which he ought, considering the extensive patronage he has received from the American publick.

Mr. Webster, in the preface prefixed to his dictionary, published in 1817, observed, "It is very desirable that a uniform orthography may prevail among the citizens of the United States. This can never be the case while they use a variety of English books, which do not agree in spelling;" yet the dictionary, to which these remarks are prefixed, disagrees with his spelling-book, which was *revised* and published the *same* year, (1817,) in the *orthography* of all the words noted above! and the same words were also contradictory in the dictionary published by him in 1806, and his spelling-book then in use: and farther, his dictionary published in 1817 differs in orthography from the one he published in 1806, as much as any two *English* dictionaries extant.

It is certainly of the utmost importance that correct or uniform orthography should exist in the spelling-book and dictionary, for the habits of spelling which we acquire from them remain with us through life. This is so evidently a fact, that by observation we shall find that the words, which are spelled in Webster's spelling-book, contrary to Webster's dictionary, or those of Johnson and Walker, are spelled in this erroneous manner, not only in most of the newspapers of the day, but in many of the writings of our most distinguished scholars and statesmen, who obtained their first knowledge of these words from Mr. Webster's book.

I shall now give an exposition of the *contradictory orthography* of the two editions of his dictionary, published in 1806 and 1817; but as the limits of this review will not permit me to show all of this class, I shall confine the exposition principally to the words which are contained in his spelling-book, for the two following reasons: First; many of these words were spelled in his dictionary (of 1806) as they were in the spelling-book, *differently* from the dictionary published in 1817, and the others *agreeably* to it; so that in his dictionary published in 1817, these words which *agreed* with his spelling-book, in his dictionary (1806) are changed, and *disagree* with it; and those which *disagreed* with his spelling-book, in his dictionary (1806) are also changed, and *agree* with it, while the orthography of his spelling-book has remained the same, during the *counter-revolution* of it in his two dictionaries alluded to! Secondly; some of these words agree with Walker's orthography in Webster's dictionary published in 1806, and others with that of 1817. In almost every case, in which he disagrees in his spelling-book with his dictionaries, and agrees with Dilworth's spelling-book, and in which he *disagrees* in his dictionary, 1817, with that of 1806, he *agrees* with Walker! whose *orthography* and *pronunciation* he has treated with *contempt* whenever he has spoken of them! [See the preface to his dictionary, published in 1806, page 11; and his appeal "*To the publick*," published at New Haven, March, 1826.]

The following words form a part of this class; the first spelling of the word is agreeably to the edition of the dictionary, 1806; and the latter, that of 1817: abatable, abateable; abridgment, abridgement; acknowledgment, acknowledgement; aiddecamp, aidecamp; allege, allegeable, alleged, alledge, alledgeable, alledged; apposit, appositly, appositness, apposite, appositely, appositeness; assigner, assignor; blamable, blamableness, blamably, blameable, blameableness, blameably; brimful, brimfull; buccaneer, bucanneer; callico, calico; corselet, corslet; crepuscle, crepuscule, (differently pronounced also;) crossexamin, crossexamine; curvilinear, curvillinear; determin, determine; disciplin, discipline; enrolment, enrollment; enterprise, enterprize; envelope, envelop; examin, examine; handfull, handful; havock, havoc; headach, headache; heartach, heartache; jewellery, jewelry; medicin, medicine; opposit, opposite; perquisit, perquisite; pneumatics, pnumatics; prophesy (noun,) prophecy; redout, redoutable, redoubt, redoubtable; requisit, requisitly, requisitness, requisite, requisitely, requisiteness; sepulcher, sepulchre; tenon, tennon; unblamable, unblameable; windlas, windlass; woollen, woolen; woolliness, wooliness, &c. &c. As the preceding words, when used by Mr. Webster in defining other words in the same dictionary, are spelled as they are where their accent and definition are given, he cannot with propriety denominate them errours of *accident*, or of the *printers*: for instance; dictionary 1806, Argument, reason *alleged*; 1817, reason *alledged*; 1806, Canvass, to *examin*, 1817 to *examine*; 1806, Consider, to *examin*, 1817, to *examine*; 1806, Defective, *blamable*, 1817, *blameable*; 1806, Medicate, to tincture with *medicins*, 1917, to tincture with *medicines*, &c.

I have before referred to Mr. Webster's remarks in the preface to his dictionary, (1806, page 8,) relative to the "palpable absurdities and preposterous anomalies" in other dictionaries; but I presume every candid reader will admit, after having examined the following exposition, and what has already been shown of *his* orthography, that the preceding *very mild* remark is as justly applicable to Mr. Webster's orthography, as to that of any other author: As, in his dictionary (1806) he omitted the final *e* in the terminations *ine* and *ite* unaccented; thus, in doctrin, determin, medicin, quarantin, jessamin, libertin, examin, deposit, hypocrit, apposit, opposit, reposit, requisit, perquisit; and retained it in the same termination in exquisite, favorite, and infinite! And in his dictionary (1817) he has retained the *e* in the last three noted above, and inserted it in doctrine, determine, medicine, examine, apposite, opposite, perquisite, and requisite, in which it was not in the dictionary (1806)! He has jockey with *ey*, and

turky with *y* only! cloke with *oke*, and oak and soak with *oa*! tranquillity with *ll*, and intranquillity with one *l*! and in his dictionary (1817) he has apposite and requisite with final *e*, and pre-requisit and inapposit without it! abateable with *e* after *t*, and debatable without it! &c. and yet in all of the above cases, in which Mr. Webster's orthography is neither consistent nor uniform, Johnson and Walker observe both consistency and uniformity.

In view of the expositions I have made, I presume every person will perfectly agree with Mr. Webster in his statement in the preface to his dictionary, that "the more books are made, the more the honest inquirer will be perplexed and confounded with discordant principles," when he has published two dictionaries which do not agree with each other, and both disagree with his spelling-book!

PRONUNCIATION.

I shall now take notice of Mr. Webster's "ANALYSIS OF SOUNDS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE," prefixed to his spelling-book; and shall point out what I consider *defective* in this "*Analysis*."

Mr. Webster has, in his Analysis, given a very useful explanation of the word LANGUAGE; has given very explicit definitions of an *articulate sound*, a *vowel*, a *consonant*, and of a *diphthong*; yet none of these were taken notice of by Mr. Dilworth, except the *vowel* and *consonant*.

Mr. Dilworth, in noting the *vowel* sounds, has given long (a) as in cape, short (a) as in cap, broad (a) as in ball; but not the sound of *a* in what, &c.; long (e) as in mete, short (e) as in met, long (i) as in time, short (i) as in tin; long (o) as in note, short (o) as in not; but not the sound of *o* in move, &c.; long (u) as in tune, short (u) as in tun; but not the sound of *u* in bush, &c.: all of these evident defects Mr. Webster corrected. In noting the sounds of the consonants, Mr. Dilworth was equally defective; for instance, he has not noted that *c* has the sound of *sh*; that *t* is a consonant in many words, as in bullion, &c.; that *s* has the sound of *sh*, or *zh*; or that *x* has the sound of *gz* in many words. These defects are also in part corrected by Mr. Webster.

Mr. Webster has not informed us at all in his Analysis of the sounds of the vowels, that many of the above vowel sounds are represented by different letters, although in his spelling lessons he has figures to represent them; as, long *a* is represented by *e* in there; long *e* by *i* in shire; short *u* by *e* in her, *i* in third, *o* in worm, &c.: yet Mr. Dilworth took notice of all these in their proper place.

In Mr. Webster's Analysis of the sounds of the consonants, he has told us that some of the consonants are *silent*, yet there are other consonants which are *silent*, respecting the silence of which he has said nothing; again, he has told us that some of the consonants are *never* silent, yet there are others which are never silent also, of which he has said nothing. This I presume will be considered a very great defect; for the scholar would suppose, (and reasonably,) that as he has spoken of the silence of some of the consonants, he had noted *all* which are *silent* in his spelling lessons; yet this is not the case.

He says "B has but one sound, as in bite." He has not told us that it is silent before *t* in the same syllable, as in debtor, page 47, subtle, page 48; after *m* in the same syllable in many words, as in limb, jamb, dumb, &c. page 36, or that it is ever silent. "C is always sounded like *k* or *s*—like *k* before *a*, *o*, and *u*—and like *s* before *e*, *i*, and *y*." Here we are told that *c* is *always* sounded like *k* or *s*, but he has not informed us which of these sounds *c* has before *l* and *r*. If "*c* is *always* sounded like *k* or *s*," how would Mr. Webster pronounce sacrifice, suffice, and discern, with their derivatives? Certainly sacrifise, suffise, dissern: but he has not pronounced them at all, either in his spelling-book or dictionary. Again, in speaking of C, he says, "When followed by *i* or *e* before a vowel, the syllable slides into the sound of *sh*; as in cetaceous, gracious, social, which are pronounced cetashus, grashus, soshal." Now, I would ask whether the *syllable* has the sound of *sh* in these words, or has *c* or *ci* this sound? To this question we shall find an answer in his examples over Table 34, where he says, "Words in which *cie*, *sie*, and *tie*, are pronounced *she*; *tia* and *cia*, *sha*, &c." Here he does *not* say that the whole syllable, cient, sient, tient, tial, tiate, cial, or ciate, slides into the sound of *sh*! He says, "At the end of words it (*c*) is always hard like *k*, as in public." But he has not informed us whether it should be sounded like *k* or *s* at the end of a *syllable*, as vaccine, flaccid, sleeky, &c. He has not told us that *c* is silent in czar, p. 38, in victuals, p. 48, in indict, p. 52, &c. or that it is ever silent. "D has only one sound, as in dress, bold." As Mr. Webster has not given any rules for the pronunciation of the termination *ed*, we must not, agreeably to the above rule, ever pronounce *d* like *t* in this termination, as at-tach-ed, pass-ed, fa-ced, &c. &c. not at-tatsht, past, faste, &c. He has not told us that *d* is silent in the first syllable of stadtholder, p. 61, in wednesday, &c. or that it is ever silent. "F has its own proper sound, as in life, fever, except in *of*, where it has the sound of *v*." This letter is not silent in his spelling lessons, yet he has not stated it. "G before *a*, *o*, and *u*, has its hard sound, as in gave, go, gun. Before *e*, *i*, and *y*, it has the same hard sound in some words, and in others the sound of *j*." But he has not informed us whether *g* should have the sound of *j* before *l* and *r*, or its hard sound, as in glove, grain, &c. He has not told us that *g* is silent before *n* in the same syllable, as in sovereign, p. 49, in arraign, and assign, p. 51, in benign, condign, design, &c. p. 52, or that it is ever silent. In speaking of H he says, "H can hardly be said to have any sound, but it denotes an aspiration or impulse of breath, which modifies the sound of the following vowel, as in heart, heave." He has not told us that *h* is silent after *r*, as in rhomb, p. 40, &c. "J is the mark of a compound sound, or union of sounds, which may be represented by *dzh*, or the soft *g*, as in jelly." J is never silent, yet he has not stated it. "K has but one sound, as in king; and before *n* is always silent, as in know." Thus we see that on the same principle that *k* is silent before *n*, *g* is silent: yet Mr. Webster noted one and not the other. "L has but one sound, as in lame. It is silent before *k*, as in walk." L is also silent before *f*, in half and calf, p. 38, and before *v* in calve, halve, &c., before *m* in balm, calm, &c. p. 57, before *d* in could, would, &c. p. 59; yet Mr. Webster has not noted one of these. "M has but one sound, as in man; and is never silent." "N has but one sound, as in not, and is silent after *m*, as in hymn." Agreeably to this rule we must pronounce thank, think, as if written than-k, thin-k, &c., instead of sounding the *n* like *ng*, as if written thangk, thinck, &c. This latter pronunciation is the general and natural sound of the letter *n* when followed by *k*, or its representatives, hard *c*, *g*, or *x*, in an accented syllable; and I doubt not at all that Mr. Webster *himself*, in pronouncing the words of this class, gives *n* the latter pronunciation. Mr. Webster has indirectly admitted this sound of *n* in the pronunciation of the 12 words at the close of Table 40, over which he says, "the following are pronounced as though they were written with double *g*." On examination we shall find that this double *g* is produced by the combination of the letters *n* and *g*, as *n* being in an accented syllable followed by *g* hard, it has the sound of *ng*; and *g* never having this double sound when written singly, except when preceded by *n* in an accented syllable, most clearly proves that the first sound of *g* is produced by the *n*; consequently the words in which *n* is in an accented syllable followed by the letter *k*, and its representatives, (which are guttural sounds as well as hard *g*) should be classed as much as the 12 words at the close of Table 40, and for the same reason. He has not told us that *n* is also silent after *l* at the end of a word, as kiln, p. 146, brick-kiln, p. 46, &c., neither has he told us in what situation *n* is silent after *m*, whether at the end or middle of a word, or in both situations. This distinction is of much importance; for, although *n* is silent after *m* at the end of the words autumn, condemn, &c. it is not silent after *m* in the middle of the words autumnal, condemnation, &c.

"P has one uniform sound, as in pit." He has not told us that *p* is silent before *s* at the beginning of a word, as in psalm, p. 57, between *m* and *t*, as in tempter, p. 48, in pre-emption, redemption, &c. p. 74, before *n* in pneumatics, p. 63, &c. or that it is ever silent. "Q has the power of *k*, and is always followed by *u* as in question." This letter is never silent, yet he has not stated it. "R has one sound only as in barrel." This letter is not silent in his spelling lessons, yet he has not stated it. "S has the sound of *c*, as in so; of *z*, as in rose." As *c* has two sounds, that of *k* and of *s*, how are we to know from the above rule, which sound of *c*, *s* should have in this word? In speaking of *s* he says, "when followed by *i* preceding a vowel, the syllable has the sound of *sh* as in mission; of *zh* as in osier." The *syllable*—Is it not surprising that Mr. Webster should state that the *syllable*, instead of *s* or *si*, has the sound of *sh* or *zh*? And what renders it still more surprising is, that he has stated on the first page of his analysis, that "there is also a distinct sound expressed by *ng* as in long; and another by *s* or *z*, as in fusion, azure, which sound might be represented by *zh*." Here he states that the distinct sound of *zh* is represented by *s*, instead of a *whole syllable*. Again, he says, Table 33, "In the following words *si* sound like *zh*;" and in this table we find *osier* and *fusion*, the same words given in the preceding examples. Thus, we have in Mr. Webster's spelling-book, *three rules* relative to the sound of *zh*, not two of which agree! First, the sound of *zh* is expressed by *s*, in *fusion*; secondly, the *syllable* has the sound of *zh*; thirdly, *si* have the sound of *zh*! And farther, he was not informed us when we must pronounce *s* like *sh*, or when like *zh*; nor has he told the reason for pronouncing *s* like *sh* in mission, and like *zh* in osier; that *s* should be sounded like *sh* when followed by *i* and a vowel, and is preceded by a consonant, and is like *zh* when followed as above, and preceded by a vowel; neither has he told us that *s ever has the sound of zh* when followed by *u*, although in his table 33, over which he has, "in the following words, *si* sound like *zh*," he has inserted six words in which *s* is followed by *u*! Again, he has not told us that *c*

ever has the sound of *sh*, when followed by long *u* and preceded by the accent, as in censure, sensual, &c. He has not told us that *s* is silent in *isle*, *island*, *viscount*, &c. p 112, or that it is ever silent. "*T* has its proper sound, as in turn, at the beginning of words and end of syllables. In all the terminations in *tion*, and *tial*, *ti* have the sound of *sh*, as in nation, nuptial; except when preceded by *s* or *x*, in which cases they have the sound of *ch*, as in question, mixtion." Thus we shall find, on examination, that in giving the sounds of *sh*, which are expressed by *s*, *s* and *t*, he has given the rule in different terms; as, in speaking of *c*, the *syllable slides* into the sound of *sh*, of *s*, the *syllable has* the sound of *sh*, and here of *t*, he says, *ti* have the sound of *sh*; and farther, in noting these sounds he has not told the reason why *c*, *s*, and *t*, have the sound of *sh*; which is, that they are followed by a diphthong and preceded by the accent. He has not told us that *t* is silent in *chasten* and *glisten*, p. 47, in *mortgage*, p. 48, in *sciat*, p. 52, &c. or that it is ever silent." "*V* has uniformly one sound, as in voice, live, and is never silent." How then shall we pronounce *sevennight*, p. 48, in which *v* is in italick, and consequently silent, agreeably to Mr. Webster's rules relative to italick letters in his spelling lessons? "*W* has the power of a vowel, as in dwell; or a consonant, as in well, will." He has not told us that it is silent before *r*, as in wry and wright, p. 34, in wrap, wreck, wrench, p. 36, &c. &c, or that it is ever silent.

"*X* has the sound of *ks* as in wax: or of *gz*, as in exist, and in other words, when followed by an accented syllable beginning with a vowel. In the beginning of Greek names, it has the sound of *z*, as in Xerxes, Xenophon." This is the *only* instance in Mr. Webster's Analysis in which he has admitted, either directly or indirectly, that any consonant has its sound varied from being in an accented or unaccented syllable, preceded or followed by a vowel! I cannot conceive why Mr. Webster has omitted to take notice of the influence of accent when treating of the different sounds of the *other* consonants: for, the same principle of analogy which would lead him to note the accent when treating of *x*, would have dictated to him the propriety of taking accent into the account when treating of the sound of *sh*, represented by *c*, *s* or *t*, as in gracious, pension, action; of *tsh* represented by *t*, as in question, &c.; or of *zh*, represented by *s*, as in vision, &c. If, agreeably to the above rule, *x* has the "sound of *gz*, as in exist, and in other words, when followed by an accented syllable beginning with a vowel," in *all* cases (and Mr. Webster has *not* noted any exceptions,) how shall we pronouce doxology, proximity, fixation, relaxation, taxation, vexation, &c.? Certainly; dog-zology, prog-zimity, fig-zation, relaz-zation, tag-zation, veg-zation, &c.: as "*x* is followed by an accented syllable beginning with a vowel" in these words. Again, Mr. Webster has not, in the preceding rule, told us that *x* should have the sound of *gz* when followed by an accented syllable beginning with *h*, although he has inserted the words *exhaust* and *exhort*, in table 41, over which he has, "In the following, with their compounds and derivatives, *x* is pronounced like *gz*." "*Z* has its own sound usually, as in zeal, freeze." Mr. Webster has not informed us that *z* ever has the sound of *zh*; but he has inserted the words glazier, seizure, and azure, in table 33, over which he has, "In the following words, *si* sound like *zh*"! Although there is no *si* in the above words, yet as there is the sound of *zh* in every other word in this table, (33,) we may *reasonably* suppose that Mr. Webster intended the *z* to be sounded like *zh*, notwithstanding he has not informed us in table 33, or when treating of the letter *z*, that it ever has this sound. "*Ch* have the sound of *tsh* in words of English origin, as in chip—in some words of French original they have the sound of *sh*, as in machine—and in some words of Greek origin, the sound of *k*, as in chorus." He has not told us that *ch* is silent in *schism*, p. 36, *yacht*, p. 38, or that it is ever silent. "*Gh* have the sound of *f*, as in laugh, or are silent, as in light." He has not told us that *gh* is pronounced like *k*, in hough, lough, shough, (see Webster's Dictionary); that the *h* only is silent in some words, as in ghost, p. 35, gherkin, p. 99. "*Ph* have the sound of *f*, as in philosophy; except in Stephen, where it has the sound of *v*." He has not told us that *ph* is silent in phthisic, p. 47, or that it is ever silent. "*Sh* has one sound only, as in shell; but its use is often supplied by *ti*, *ci*, and *ce*, before a vowel, as in motion, gracious, cetaceous." Here he has stated that the use of *sh* is often supplied by *ti*, *ci* and *ce*, but has omitted to mention *si* also. Again, in the above rule, he says that the use of *sh* is often supplied by *ci* and *ce*: but in treating of the letter *C*, he states that the *syllable slides* into the sound of *sh*. "*Th* has two sounds, aspirate and vocal—aspirate, as in think, bath—vocal, as in those, that, bathe." He has not told us that *h*, in this combination, is silent in asthma, p. 46, in isthmus and phthisic, p. 47, in thyme, &c.; or that it is ever silent. "*Sc* before *a*, *o*, *u* and *r*, are pronounced like *sk*, as in scale, scoff, sculpture, scribble before *e*, *i*, *y*, like soft *c*, or *s*, as in scene, science, Scythian." He has not told us that *sc* has the sound of *sh*, as in conscience, conscious, &c.; yet he has these words in table 34, in which *c*, *s* and *t* have the sound of *sh*. After these rules, Mr. Webster has given concise explanations of the "Formation of Words and Sentences," and "Of Accent, Emphasis and Cadence." Then follows his "Key to the following Work," in which he has given examples of the different vowel sounds, as represented by *figures* placed over the vowels of the accented syllables in his spelling lessons, the *representation* of which he has explained in his "Explanation of the Key. A figure stands as the invariable representative of a certain sound. The figure 1 represents the long sound of the letters, *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, or *ew*, and *y*; number 2 the short sound of the same characters: number 3 marks the sound of broad *a*, in *half*; number 4 represents the sound of *a* in *father*; number 5 represents the *short* sound of broad *a* as in *not*, *what*; number 6 represents the sound of *o* in *move*, commonly expressed by *oo*; number 7 represents the short sound of *oo* in *root*, *bush*; number 8 represents the sound of *u* short, made by *e*, *i* and *o*, as in *her*, *bird*, *come*, pronounced *hur*, *burd*, *cum*; number 9 represents the first sound of *a*, made by *e*, as in *there*, *vein*, pronounced *thare*, *vane*: number 10 represents the French sound of *i*, which is the same as *e* long." This representation of the vowel sounds by figures was, unquestionably, a great improvement upon Mr. Dilworth's Spelling-book, in which, as was stated on page 33, the vowel sounds were not classed or noted. In the application of these figures in the various spelling lessons, the vowels are classed whose sounds are of the same *quantity*: as long *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, &c. under number 1; short *a*, *e*, *i*, &c. under number 2; or those whose sounds are similar, as her, b rd, come, &c. under 8, in which the vowels *e*, *i*, and *o* represent the sound of short *u*, &c. &c.; and "a figure placed over the first word, marks the sound of the vowel in all that follow in that column, until contradicted by another figure." As Mr. Webster has given a "Key to the following Work," and has stated that "a figure stands as the invariable representative of a certain sound," we might reasonably suppose that his key would be sufficiently extensive to represent all the vowel sounds made by different letters, acknowledged by him in his spelling lessons; and that no figure should be placed over a vowel in his lessons which is not represented in his key, or in the explanation of its use and application, or which does not correspond with its representation in the key: yet his key is *defective* in both of the above particulars. For instance, on page 39, he has the following note; "Under this figure, (reference to figure 2) in the words *skirt*, &c. *i* has the second sound of *e*." On this page (39) are the words skirt, dirge, virge, firm, stirp, chirp, quirk and fir, p. 41, birth, girth, mirth, &c. p. 49, virtue, page 52, affirm, p. 62, firmament, &c. with *i* under figure 2, and if we follow Mr. Webster's rule, that "a figure stands as the invariable representative of a certain sound," the *i* must, at least in the above words not on page 39, have its short sound as in *pin*, agreeably to his key! If he should say that the note on page 39, was intended to apply to all of the words in which *i* is under 2, near the close of the different spelling lessons, then I would inquire, whether he intended to give *i* the sound of second *e*, in the word *principle*, p. 61, and in *miracle*, p. 62, which are in the same predicament with the words above noted; if he did not intend that sound, then who can avoid admitting the imperfection of Mr. Webster's key, or its improper application? It is also quite singular that he has given this "sound of second *e*" to many words, and the sound of *u* short to others of like formation, both of which should evidently be sounded alike; as p. 39, *virge*, (verge,) p. 49, *virgin* (vurgin,) p. 40 and 99, *girt* (gurt,) p. 41, *girth* (gerth,) &c. Mr. Webster has, at or near the close of nearly all of his spelling lessons, given a class of words in which *e* has its short sound, and over which is placed number 2. If he intended to class those words only, in which *e* is immediately followed by *r* and another consonant in an accented syllable, for the purpose of pointing out in a particular manner the correct pronunciation of *e* in this situation, as it was formerly sounded like flat *a* in these words; as *mercy* (marcy,) *perfect* (parfect,) *merchant* (marchant,) &c. &c.; why did he insert words in these classes in which *e* is not followed by *r* in an accented syllable, as venom, p. 23, intend, p. 25, regulate, p. 27, overwhelming, p. 32, effeminacy, inveteracy, intemperately, p. 69? If he did *not* intend to note these words in a particular manner, as stated above, then these words above referred to, should be in the first class of words, in each lesson, which are placed under figure 2; in either case, there is an evident defect in the application of the figure, or in the classification of the words. He says, "The number 1 represents the long sound of the letters *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, or *ew*, and *y*: number 2, the short sound of the same characters;" yet he has not given any example in his key in which *ew* or *o* is placed under figure 2; neither is *ew* under 2 in any instance in his spelling lessons, nor *o* but in the two words *doth*, p. 41, and *acknowledge*, p. 63! He has given the word *tun* in his key, to represent the sound of *u* short with figure 2 over it! and on page 40 he has spelled it *ton* with figure 8 over it; and it is spelled *tun* in his dictionary published in 1806 and 1817. He says, "number 6 represents the sound of *o* in *move*," and on p. 63, he has *maneuver* with *u* under 6, although he has no example in his key to show that *u* ever has this sound. He says, "number 8 represents the sound of *u* short made by *e*, *i*, and *o*," yet he has *rum*, p. 39, and *dunce*, p. 40, with the *u* under 8, instead of placing them under 2!

Great perplexity and embarrassment frequently arise from the manner that these figures are placed over the

vowels, being on the same type with the letter, it is quite difficult for the scholar to determine which figure is on the vowel before him; and when the figure 1 is placed over *i* it is particularly perplexing to a young scholar. The figures ought, undoubtedly, to be on a separate type from the letter, whenever the sounds of the vowels change, that they may be at once distinguished both by teacher and scholar.

The following rule of Mr. Webster's Key, which is to denote the silent letters in the spelling lessons by printing them in italick characters, was also a *very great* improvement. [This *improvement*, however, was, I believe, original in Mr. Perry's spelling book.] "Silent letters are printed in italick characters: thus, in head, goal, build, people, *fight*, the italick letters have no sound." Mr. Webster has omitted to note the silence of many letters in his spelling lessons, although he has noted the silence of others which are evidently of the same class, as will be fully shown. "S when printed in italick, is not silent; but pronounced like *z* as in *devise*, pronounced *devize*." If *s* should be pronounced like *z*, when printed in italick, why is it in italick in table thirty-three, in which it is sounded like *zh*? There is evidently a contradiction between the rule quoted above, and the rule and examples placed over the table thirty-three; for if we follow the above rule, we must pronounce the *s* like *z* in table 33, as mez-ur, piez-ur, ra-zur, &c. &c.; and if the rule over the table, mezh-ur, piezh-ur, ra-zhur, &c. &c. Again, if *s* should be pronounced like *z* when in italick, how shall we pronounce Rhode Island, p. 121; Islesburg, p. 130; Carlisle, p. 138; Long-Island, p. 139; Presque-Isle, p. 140, in which the *s* is in italick? The rules respecting *ch* and *th* as it regards their classification, were treated of on page 32.

With regard to what I shall deem *contradictory* pronunciation in this treatise, I will observe, that I apply it to those cases where Mr. Webster has given a vowel or consonant a particular sound in a certain situation, and has given the same vowel or consonant a *different* sound in a *similar* situation; or where he has a vowel or consonant *silent* in a certain situation, and *not* silent in a *similar* one. For instance, he has *a*, in the termination *ant*, under figure 2, short *a* in plant, p. 19; and under 4, flat *a*, in the same termination, in pant, grant, &c. p. 36; *a* under 5, broad *a* short, in drossy, p. 23; and under 3, broad *a* long, in the same syllable dross, p. 37; *a* under 2, short *a*, in the termination *ange*, in arrange and derange, p. 24; and under 1, long *a*, in the same termination in change and strange, p. 33; *a* under 2, short *a* in the termination *ance*, in finance, p. 24; and romance, p. 25; and under 4, flat *a*, in the same termination in dance, prance, &c. p. 38; and advance, p. 59; he has pronounced *s* like *z*, in the prefix *dis*, in disarm, p. 25; but has pronounced the *s* hissing, as in sin, in disown, p. 52; although it should be sounded like *z*, as in disarm, being followed by an accented syllable beginning with a vowel in both cases. He has divided prin-cip-al, p. 26, and prin-ci pal, p. 147; *o* under 5, broad *a* short, in immortal, p. 28; and under 3, broad *a* long, in mortal, p. 48; *s* like *z* in dissolvent, p. 28; and hissing in indissolvable, p. 72; he has noted *p* as *silent* between *m* and *t*, and has it in italick in tempter, p. 48, assumption, consumption, pre-emption, redemption, p. 74, exempt, p. 103; but has sounded the *p* in the same situation, and has it in roman in sumptuary, peremptory, p. 29, attempt, contempt, p. 52; presumptive, p. 63; sumptuously, p. 65; contemptible, p. 67; *o* under 3, broad *a* long, in form, for, cord, p. 37; and under 5, broad *a* short in the same syllables, in per-form-ance, re-cord-er, mis-for-tune, p. 63; for-mid-a-ble, p. 66; u-ni-form-i-ty, p. 72; and farther, it is *impossible* to give *o* the sound of broad *a* short, as in what, as represented by figure 5, in these words, as the *o* is followed by *r* and another consonant, and *necessarily* has the sound of broad *a* long, as in fall; the same may be observed with regard to *o*, which he has under figure 5, in abhor, p. 25; ornament, p. 27; abortive, indorsement, importance, p. 63; orchester, p. 95; whereas it should be under 3, broad *a* long, in all of the above words, being followed by *r* single, or by *r* and another consonant, as in border, corner, mortal, &c. p. 48; adorn, suborn, &c. p. 52; deformity, subordinate, &c. p. 67; *a* in wasp and want, under 3, broad *a* long, p. 37, and under 5, broad *a* short, in wash, wast, and wand, p. 38; *o* in dross, loss, &c. under 3, p. 37; and in fosse, under 5, p. 38; *a* under 5, broad *a* short, in fault, p. 39; and under 3, broad *a* long, in the same syllable in fault-y, p. 48; *oo* under 7, in loof, p. 39; and under 6, in aloof, p. 52. The evident contradiction in the pronunciation of words in which *i* is followed by *r* single, or by *r* and another consonant, was taken notice of on page 34; as, virge, (verge,) *i* like *e* short, p. 39; virgin, (vurgin,) *i* like *u* short, p. 49, &c. He has *e* and *y* both in roman in the termination *ey* in abbey, p. 46; and the *i* in italick and the *y* only in roman, in the same termination, in chimney, p. 47; he has the *t* and *h* both silent in asthma, p. 46, but the *h* only is silent in isthmus, p. 47; he has *t* silent when preceded by *s* and followed by *en*, in chasten and glisten, p. 47; and has sounded it in christen, p. 95, in which it is preceded by *s* and followed by *en*, as in the two words above referred to! On p. 47 is franchise, with the *s* hissing and the *e* in italick, making the *i* short; p. 63, disfranchise, with the *s* in italick, sounded like *z*, and the *e* in roman, making the *i* long; p. 66, disfranchisement with the *s* italick, sounded like *z*, and the *e* in italick also, making the *i* short, so that the syllable *chise*, being immediately preceded by the accent, is pronounced three different ways in the three words above noted; thus, tshis, tshize, and tshiz! Page 47, *e* in italick and *o* roman in luncheon; and same page, *e* in roman and *o* in italick in punchoon, and p. 48, truncheon, pronounced lunchun, punchen, and trunchen! Page 48, *o* in fortune, under 3, broad *a* long, and *e* in roman, making the *u* long; and p. 63, *o* in misfortune, under 5, broad *a* short, and the *e* italick, making the *u* short, thus, fawr-tune and mis-for-tun! Page 49, *e* under 5, in knowledge, and under 2 in the same syllable, in acknowledge, p. 63; p. 52, the final *e* in roman in approve and above, and italick in disprove and belove; over Table 30, he has given whole syllables for examples when speaking of the sound of *tsh* or *sh*, as *tion*, *tian*, *cion*, *cial*, &c.; and over Table 34, he has given parts of syllables for examples, as *cie*, *sie*, *tie*, &c.; p. 91, the *s* is not italick in billiards and billions, as it should be agreeably to his rule respecting *s*, for it is impossible to pronounce these words unless we pronounce the *s* like *z*. The contradiction in his pronunciation of *xio* like *kshu* in anxious, and not in flexion, fluxion, &c., p. 91, was taken notice of on page 30. On p. 95, chord is under 5, broad *a* short, and on p. 37, cord is under 3, broad *a* long, and on p. 148, he has given them as being pronounced alike, making figures 3 and 5 synonymous in their representation! Page 97, *e* roman in machine, and italick in machine-ry; p. 103, are exhaust and exhort, in the former of which *h* is sounded, and in the latter it is silent, although *h* commences an accented syllable, and is immediately preceded by *z* in both words. Thus I have given a list of words which I conceive to be pronounced in a contradictory manner in Mr. Webster's spelling lessons. As I intend to compare the principles of pronunciation by J. Walker with those of Mr. Webster, on some future occasion, I shall not bring the propriety or justness of Mr. Webster's principles into question until that time.

As Mr. Webster has given the pronunciation of *few* words (except their accentuation) in his dictionary (1817,) we can not detect *many* contradictions in *pronunciation* in his dictionary and spelling-book; but from the few which he *has* pronounced, I presume, had he given the pronunciation in his dictionary of all the words contained in his spelling book, there would have been the same *happy consistency* and *uniformity* between the dictionary and spelling-book in their *pronunciation*, that there is in their *orthography*, which was exhibited on page 32. For instance: p. 25, romance is accented on the second syllable, and on the *first* in the dictionary: si-mony, *i* long, sim-ony, *i* short, in the dictionary; p. 33, beard, *e* silent and *a* long, and *a* silent and *e* long in his dictionary; p. 37, wasp, broad *a* long, and broad *a* short in the dictionary; p. 46, asthma, *t* silent in the spelling-book, and sounded in his dictionary; *e* italick in brimstone, making the *o* short, and roman in the dictionary, making the *o* long; p. 47, bustle pronounced bus-tl, *t* sounded, and in his dictionary pronounced bussle, *t* silent; p. 49, sovereign pronounced suv-ren, two syllables, and suv-er-un, three syllables, in his dictionary; p. 52, upright and sojourn accented on the *second* syllable, and on the *first* in the dictionary; p. 59, heroism divided he-roism, *e* long, and her-oism, *e* short, in his dictionary; p. 63, appraiser, *i* accented, *a* (second syllable) accented in his dictionary; disfranchise, *e* roman, making the *i* long, *e* italick, making the *i* short, dictionary; p. 66, comparable, accented on the *second* syllable, and on the *first* in the dictionary; p. 71, monosyllable and polysyllable, accented on the *third* syllable, and on the *first* in the dictionary; p. 93, apotheosis, accented on the *third* syllable, and on the *fourth* in the dictionary; p. 95, te-trarch, *e* long, and tet-rarch, *e* short, in the dictionary; p. 97, dernier accented on the *second* syllable, and on the *first* in the dictionary; p. 101, pageantry, *a* short, and *a* long, dictionary; p. 102, adagio, *a* short, (second syllable,) and *a* long, dictionary; p. 108, donor and bailor accented on the *second* syllable, and on the *first* in his dictionary, &c. &c.; and what is quite *surprising* (not to say *absurd*) is, that in nearly every instance in which he has accented or pronounced a word differently in his dictionary from his spelling-book, he agrees with *Walker's* pronunciation, whose principles he has *condemned* in a very zealous and patriotick manner.

When this review was published in the Albany Argus, I pointed out the differences in pronunciation between Mr. Webster's spelling-book and Walker's dictionary, for the purpose of showing the extreme *impropriety* and *absurdity* which exist in the use of these two books in the *same* school, which is usual in many parts of the United States. The words in which Mr. Webster *disagrees* with Mr. Walker, (agreeably to the principles of Mr. Webster's *old* spelling-book,) amount to at least *five thousand!* and if we include their derivatives, probably *eight thousand!* so that it is not at all surprising that there is so much contradictory pronunciation among school teachers, and so little uniformity in pronunciation with publick speakers, when (as it has been fully shown) Mr. Webster's *pronunciation is contradictory* both in his own spelling-book and school dictionary; and disagrees in his *spelling-book to a very great extent* with Walker's, which is generally used in the same school with it, where the

orthography and pronunciation are taught! so prominent are these differences in pronunciation between Webster's spelling-book and Walker's dictionary, that on opening this spelling-book at one place (pages 38 and 39) we shall perceive at *one view* no less than *eighty two* variations from Walker's dictionary! Hence the impropriety of using these two books in the *same* school!

Having pointed out what I considered *defective* or *contradictory* in Mr. Webster's spelling-book, I shall now conclude my remarks on that book by taking notice of some declarations made by Mr. Webster relative to his spelling-book, in his APPEAL, "TO THE PUBLICK," published at New-Haven, March, 1826.

From a review of his appeal, above alluded to, I was fully convinced that Mr. Webster was not aware of the *defects* and *contradictions* contained in his spelling-book and school dictionary; and I have therefore been more particular in giving *proof* of what I have stated. In speaking of his spelling-book, he observes, "my tables are so constructed, and so nearly complete, that they *cannot* be improved." Again, he says, in speaking of the attempts to rival his book: "In order to accomplish their object, it has been found expedient to depreciate my work, and to charge me with *innovation*, and with introducing a *system of orthography and pronunciation in many respects vague and pedantic*. Surely, if this is true, if my book is really a bad one, I have been very much deceived: and I have done not only an injury, but great and extensive injury to my country." In the preceding review I have shown that his book "is really a bad one," not only in the *contradictory* and *defective* manner in which his spelling lessons are classed and arranged, [see pages 30, 31] but in the *inconsistent* and *defective* innovations in orthography adopted by him, which he did not, or could not render *consistent* or *uniform* throughout the language! [See pages 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.]

To my remarks on his spelling-book, Mr. Webster attempted an answer in the Argus of the 12th Dec. 1827, but instead of *disproving* my assertions, or endeavouring to offer any remarks in *justification* of having *continued* these *errours, defects*, and *inconsistencies* in his spelling-book for more than *forty years*, many of which are at variance with his school dictionary, [see pages 19, 32]: he has admitted the *truth* of my assertions, in the following language: "That there are some errors, defects and inconsistencies in the work, is not to be wondered at; for this is precisely the fact with every English dictionary which I have yet seen;" and he indulges in a *decisive condemnation* of every *English* dictionary now in existence, for the purpose of *justifying* the errours of his spelling-book! Mr. Webster, in speaking of the defects of Mr. Johnson's dictionary, observed in the preface to his dictionary, published in 1806, page 19, that "To assign the causes of these defects is by no means difficult. We are told in the accounts of Johnson's life that he was almost always depressed by disease and poverty; that he was naturally indolent, and seldom wrote until he was urged by want, or the necessity of fulfilling his engagements with his bookseller. Hence it happened that he often received the money for his writings before his manuscripts were prepared. Then, when called upon for copy, he was compelled to prepare his manuscripts in haste; and it may be reasonably supposed that in some instances they were sent to the press in an unfinished state. These facts, while they may account for, by no means excuse the multitude of errors in his dictionary." But Mr. Webster cannot, with any degree of propriety or consistency, assert that *poverty* is the cause of the errours in his spelling-book or school dictionary; for, in his appeal, after having stated that his book had encountered prepossession and prejudice with success, he observed that, "if we can judge from the numbers sold; not less than *seven millions* of copies; more than half, and probably two thirds of all the inhabitants of the United States have received the rudiments of their education from the use of that book." And even the publishers of Mr. Webster's book also *boast* in their advertisements of the *millions* which have been sold, as though the *quantities* sold would be a sufficient argument to convince the enlightened citizens of the United States that no *improvement* upon Mr. Webster's book *can* be made, and consequently his book *is*, and *must* be, the *best!!* Again, Mr. Webster observes, in speaking of his spelling-book, "The profits of this work, though very small, have not only been the principal support of my numerous family, but they have enabled me to accomplish a dictionary of our language, at the expense of *twenty years of labor, and thirty thousand dollars in money*." Therefore I say he cannot with propriety state that his *poverty* or want of *patronage* caused him to neglect the correction of the *defects* and *errours* pointed out by me in this review. Notwithstanding Mr. Webster's spelling-book has been very extensively patronised, and he has received *thousands of dollars* from the American citizens, yet he has suffered these errours to remain in his book year after year, without correction; [see page 32:] and thus he is so *inconsistent* and *ungenerous* as to tell those citizens who have thus *patronised* and *supported* him by making such an extensive use of his spelling-book, that a "species of slavery hangs like a mill-stone about the neck of all literary enterprize in the United States."

What Mr. Webster considers "*a species of slavery*," is, I suppose, the conduct of many of the respectable citizens in the United States, who have *presumed* to manifest an *attachment* to the principles of orthography and orthoepy of Walker's dictionary in *preference* to those taught by him. Again, he observes in his appeal, "as I have been preparing a dictionary for publication; have for many years been teased with the clamor about Walker; I have made a visit to England, and partly with a view to ascertain the real state of the language." It is indeed quite *surprising* that Mr. Webster should have visited *England* with a "view to *ascertain the real state of the language!*" by spending a few months there, more particularly as he had previously *condemned, without reserve*, all the *English* dictionaries now in use!! Again, he observes, "I presume, I can select a thousand words, if not double the number, from Walker's dictionary, marked for a pronunciation which no man would venture to use, in any decent society in that country." And yet he has *not condescended* to furnish the citizens of the United States with a *single* example of Mr. Walker's *indecent* pronunciation! Now, I would inquire of Mr. Webster whether the pronunciation of some words given by *him* would be thus pronounced "in any *decent society*" in England? as *na-tur, vur-tu, in-sure, pass, paint, dance, after*, (flat *a*) &c.; instead of *na-tshure, ver-tshue, in-shure, pass, pant, danse, after*, (*a* short,) &c. Mr. Webster, for the purpose, no doubt, of overthrowing Mr. Walker's principles of orthography and pronunciation at once, observed in his appeal, that "if the people of this country *will* have an English book to follow, if nothing but *English* will answer, I would recommend Jones' dictionary for this purpose. Jones is a later author, who seems to have followed Walker for the express purpose of correcting his errors—and his work, for the simplicity and consistency of his scheme, is far preferable to any other British publication." It is *truly astonishing* that Mr. Webster should "*recommend Jones' dictionary*" to the citizens of the United States, when Jones *disagrees* in orthography with Webster's *innovations* in every instance, and *agrees* with *Walker*, whose orthography Mr. Webster has *so strenuously condemned!* as in the retention of the final *k* in *publick, musick*, etc.; the retention of the *u* in unaccented *our*, as in *favour, honour*, etc.; the termination *re* instead of *er*, as in *metre, sceptre*, etc. [See pages 7, 8, 9, and Webster's appeal on this subject]: and even Mr. Jameson published a dictionary in London in 1827, in which he retains this orthography, so much *condemned* by Mr. Webster, and *agrees* with Mr. Walker! Hence, it must be admitted that Mr. Webster's *zeal* for something different from *English* led him to adopt *innovations* without regard to their *defects, propriety, consistency*, or *uniformity*; for he has not carried a *single innovation* through the language, [see pp. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]; and, instead of producing *arguments* to convince the *American* people of the *utility* of his *innovations* in orthography, he has adopted an *easier* method, that of *condemning* every *English* lexicographer, without reserve, who has been so *presumptuous* and *unfortunate* as to *disagree* with his (Webster's) *favourite notions of innovations* in orthography!! Again, it is also *quite surprising* that Mr. Webster should "recommend" Jones' pronunciation to the *American* people, when Jones *differs more* from Webster's pronunciation than he does from Walker's!! As in sounding *a* or *au* like broad *a* long when followed by *l* and another consonant, as in *calt, fault*, etc.; *a* long in angel, danger, arrange, etc.; *a* like *i* short in the termination *ate*, as in cabbage, etc.; *e* and *o* like *u* short in the termination *ory* and *ery*, as in grocery, amatory, etc.; *o* like *o* in not when followed by *ft, ss*, or *st*, as in loft, loss, and lost, etc.; *i* like *e* short in many words when followed by *r* and another consonant, as in circuit, virgin, circular, etc.; [see page 34]; *u, ue, ui*, or *eu*, like *oo* when preceded by *r*, as in brute, bruit, true, crew, etc.; *i* like *y* in many words, as folio, genius, etc.; *ci* and *ti* like *she* in the termination *cian* and *tiate*, as in associate, negotiate, and in association, negotiation, etc.; *s* like *z* in the prefix *dis* when followed by an accented syllable beginning with a flat consonant; *t* like *tsh* when followed by long *u* preceded by the accent, as in nature, virtue, etc.; *t* silent when preceded by *s* and followed by the termination *le* as in bustle, castle, etc.: and in the *accentuation* of a great many words, as horizon, contemplate, demonstrate, acceptable, etc. etc., in all of which and hundreds of others Jones *disagrees* with Webster! and *agrees* with Walker.

Thus I have given a thorough exposition of what I have considered *defective, contradictory*, or *inconsistent*, in Mr. Webster's spelling-book, school dictionary, and in his APPEAL "TO THE PUBLICK," for the purpose of exciting interest and inquiry, and thereby rendering a benefit to my fellow-citizens, by enabling them to determine whether Mr. Webster has paid that attention to the *improvement* and *correction* of his spelling-book, which the extensive patronage he has received from the people of the United States required of him; and whether, in its *present state, it should be retained in our schools*.

REVIEW

OF

WEBSTER'S ELEMENTARY SPELLING-BOOK,

COMPILED BY AARON ELY.

The Proprietor of the Elementary Spelling-Book has taken much pains to compile, in a pamphlet form, an imposing list of recommendations of that work in connexion with those of his Dictionaries. This pamphlet has been widely circulated, and the recommendations are calculated to impress the publick mind with the belief that the *Elementary* Spelling-Book is uniform in its orthography, pronunciation, and classification, and for this reason is worthy of being adopted in our schools and academies. Upon what principle these unqualified recommendations of this work have been given, it is difficult to determine; since in all these particulars it is far more erroneous and defective than the *American* Spelling-Book. I do not intend that this fact shall rest upon bare assertion, but upon proofs, which I challenge Mr. Webster and all his friends to gainsay. I am aware that in saying this, I am calling in question the certificates of men of great erudition and practical experience in various departments of literature—men whose literary reputation and publick functions present an awful preponderance to my single counterpoise; but I rest secure in the irresistible force of truth, and the sincerity of my convictions, while I hesitate not to say that it would better comport with the principles of justice and the interests of society, for gentlemen to state wherein this compilation by Mr. Ely is preferable to other books designed for instruction, than barely to assert it, how imposing soever may be the weight of their names.

If the question were—whether Mr. Webster is entitled to respect for his labours as a Lexicographer—there could be no diversity of opinion; but when it is alleged that he has reduced the orthography to uniformity—or even an approximation towards it—or that his Dictionaries are more accurate in this particular than those of Johnson and Walker—or that the *Elementary* Spelling-Book is less *contradictory* in this particular than others, the allegation requires something more than bare assertion—something more than general panegyrick to give it currency with the American people.

However laudable may have been the motives of the individuals who have thus lent the influence of their names to give popularity to these works, I fully believe I hazard little in expressing a doubt whether all or any of them have undergone the labour necessary to warrant these, in general, unqualified testimonials, some of which were given in anticipation of the publications to which they refer. Were I not personally acquainted with the fact that in this city meetings of teachers were had for the purpose of securing pledges to support the *Elementary* Spelling-Book and Duodecimo Dictionary which were then unpublished, that Mr. Webster attended these meetings in person for the purpose of explaining his principles and eulogizing his own books—that at one of these meetings a committee previously appointed made a report commending the Elementary Spelling-Book, and urging the adoption of that report upon the authority—that one of the committee "*had seen the book in manuscript*"! that at a subsequent period the most unwarrantable measures were adopted by the friends of Mr. Webster, to procure an endorsement for this compilation by the teachers in this city, which failed except as to a few individuals—and, were I not personally acquainted with the nameless devices which have been resorted to—for the purpose of forcing these publications upon the community—I might suspect myself guilty of illiberality in expressing this doubt; but possessing the knowledge I do in relation to this matter, and knowing also from experience the time and application requisite to form a correct opinion of their merits—I am irresistibly impelled to the conclusion, that personal friendship has contributed largely to the procuring of these recommendations.

Another part of this pamphlet is worthy of a passing remark. For the purpose of disseminating more widely than could be done through the medium of the quarto dictionary, Mr. Webster has thought proper to publish in this pamphlet, by a liberal extract from the introduction to that work, his often repeated, but unwarrantable attacks upon Walker. Why this relentless warfare upon the dead, "*whose works were never known*"?*

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Webster well knows that Walker did more than any other individual to render analogous the orthoepy and orthography of the language—that his principles are almost universally adopted in this country and in England—and that in that country as well as in this, "*the usage of well-bred people*" is derived from that author, instead of "forming a guide," as he would have us to understand. How preposterous the idea that in a country like that of England, where science sheds her lucid beams with refulgent splendour, there should be in this branch of Philology no guide but the varying and capricious usage of "good society."

Mr. Webster has stated in the preface to this work, that "it is designed as an improvement on the *American* Spelling-Book;" and, he also adds, "the classification, which was imperfect in that work, is here completed, and the few errors in orthography and pronunciation, which occur in that, *are corrected* in this work." It is, therefore, presumed that neither Mr. Webster nor his friends will consider it unfair in me to point out what I consider *erroneous*, *contradictory*, and *inconsistent* in the orthography, pronunciation, classification, arrangement, and division of words; more particularly, as the proprietor (Mr. Webster) has had the work before him more than *two years;* and has therefore had an opportunity to correct any *blunders* made by the compiler (Mr. Ely.)

Before entering upon an examination of this work, I will state (as was stated on page 29) what I consider the leading characteristicks of such a Spelling-Book as I should deem worthy of a general introduction into our primary schools.

1. It should contain as great a number of the words in common use as practicable, to the exclusion of extraneous and irrelevant matter; as many who attend our primary schools have no other opportunity of acquiring a correct knowledge of the elements of our language.

2. The *classification* of words should be judicious and distinct; and the system adopted be strictly and correctly adhered to.

3. The *arrangement* should be plain and simple, with a due regard to the expanding capacities and the progressive improvement of the learner.

4. In *orthography* and *orthoepy* it should correspond with the standard dictionary of the country; or strictly conform with the principles of the work it professes to follow: for the *dictionary*, and not the *spelling-book*, must be the standard of reference; and hence the importance for the uniformity and correctness of our language, that the latter work should be founded and carefully constructed upon the principles of the former.

CONTENTS.

This spelling-book comprises 168 pages, containing about nine thousand words, arranged in spelling lessons, interspersed with reading lessons, composed of detached sentences. In the selection of the words contained in the lessons for spelling, Mr. Ely seems to have used but little discretion, or discrimination; for, he has *not* inserted

* Surely if the dictionary of Walker was heretofore not known even to Members of the British Parliament until they visited this country, such a circumstance can never hereafter happen where the publications of the American Lexicographer have found an introduction. *The following is an extract from Mr. Webster's pamphlet, page 16.* Thus, "Walker is not and never has been a standard author in England; and it is remarkable that the Members of Parliament, who visited this country a few years ago, said they had never heard of that author till they came to this country."

near all of the words in most common use; while he *has inserted* a great many words *not* in common use; neither are they to be found in Mr. Webster's duodecimo school dictionary. The following list forms but a *small portion* of the most *common* words, which Mr. Ely has *entirely omitted*, and which *should* be in every spelling book!

First:—thus, abide, abound, about, above, abridge abridgment, absence, absorb, abstain, abyss, acceptable, accompany, accord, achievement, acknowledge, actuate, adapt, admiral, admittance, advance, advantage, adverb, advice, affirm, afford, again, against, agree, alarm, alledge, ambush, analyze, animal, announce, anxiety, anxious, apocrypha, apostle, appall, applaud, appreciate, apprentice, april, ardor, argue, argument, armor, arrange, artifice, assemble, assuage, assurance, astronomy, asylum, attack, attendance, auxiliary, avoid, awe, azure, baby, balance, bald, banish, baptize, bargain, beard, because, belief, believe, beware, bias, blaspheme, blind, bomb, bondage, book, bounty, breakfast, bridegroom, bright, bruise, build, burlesque, cabbage, cabinet, cadence, callus, canal, candidate, capital, capitol, capsize, captain, carriage, carve, cement, census, certain, chagrin, challenge, chaplain, charity, chase, chastisement, cheat, children, chill, chocolate, city, clapboard, closet, coalesce, coast, cobbler, coercion, coffee, college, column, combat, comet, comma, command, commence, commerce, committee, community, compact, compensate, compile, comrade, compromise, conceive, concord, concourse, confidence, confirm, connoisseur, consul, contemplate, convince, cordial, countenance, country, courage, courtesy, covet, creature, credit, criminal, crowd, crucify, cruise, crystal, cultivate, cunning, cupboard, cushion, dairy, damage, dance, death, debtor, deceive, decree, disgust, dispose, divorce, divulge, dogma, door, dote, dragon, drama, drink, drown, drowse, duchess, dullness, dumb, duplicity, dyspepsy, eclat, eclipse, ecstacy, educate, eighth, elapse, electricity, electrify, elegance, element, elevate, elevation, eloquence, eloquent, embezzle, embrace, emigrant, eminence, empty, enable, enchant, encircle, encompass, endurance, enforce, engage, enhance, enlarge, entitle, entrance, entreaty, epaulet, epigraph, equator, equivalent, essence, etiquet, eulogy, evangelical, evangelist, evening, evidence, evident, evil, evince, excellence, exchange, exchequer, excise, excite, exclude, exclusion, excommunicate, excuse, (*n*) exercise, exit, expand, expect, expedition, expend, expense, experience, experiment, explode, expose, expunge, exquisite, extension, extreme, farce, farmer, fashion, fatigue, female, fence, ferriage, field, fiend, fierce, finance, fine, finess, finis, fir, fire, firkin, flight, floor, fluid, foe, foliage, follow, font, foot, force, ford, form, fortify, forty, fosse, foundery, fountain, franchise, friend, frolick, frost, frugal, furnace, fury, futurity, gammut, gaunt, general, geology, glance, gauge, government, governor, gradual, gratify, gratitude, gravity, graze, grievance, grieve, grind, groove, grope, gross, group, guaranty, guinea, gypsum, halloo, handsome, harass, harpsichord, hatchet, haughty, havock, hazard, hearken, hearty, helmet, helve, hence, hereof, heritage, hesitation, heroine, hinderance, hint, hiss, homage, home, homely, hone, honest, honesty, hood, hoop, horrid, horse, hose, host, hotel, hover, huge, human, humiliate, hundred, hurricane, husband, identify, ignorance, illness, image, imbibe, imbank, imbitter, immoral, impatience, impoverish, impatient, impede, impend, impenitent, imperfection, impertinence, importance, imply, impudence, include, income, indent, indulge, infant, infirm, inflame, influence, infringe, ingraft, inhale, initial, innocence, insinuate, inspect, install, instance, instead, instigate, insure, insurance, intercede, intercourse, interval, interview, into, intrigue, introduce, intrude, invent, invoke, inward, inwrap, isolate, jamb, jeopard, joiner, jovial, judgment, judicious, juice, jury, justice, justify, juvenile, keel, kindness, kindred, lamb, lance, languor, lapse, latent, lateral, lathe, latitude, laudable, laurel, leisure, lemonade, leopard, liberal, liberate, liberty, library, license, licorice, lightning, lily, limb, linen, linger, linguist, litigate, locate, locust, longitude, lord, lothe, loathsome, loyal, lozenge, lucky, machine, machinery, magnify, magnitude, maintain, majesty, malady, malevolence, malice, malignant, mamma, manage, mankind, manna, manual, margin, marriage, martyr, masonry, masquerade, maxim, mechanism, medicine, meek, mellow, menace, merciful, mercy, messenger, milliner, mimic, mince, mineral, mischief, misery, mistake, mitigate, model, modify, monarchy, monopolize, monosyllable, morning, mortify, mountain, move, multiplicand, multiply, museum, musical, muskmelon, mustard, muster, mutilate, mutter, mutual, national, natural, nauseous, naval, negligence, niece, nigh, nimble, ninety, nonsense, northern, nothing, notice, notify, nourishment, nurse, nutriment, obedience, obviate, occupation, occurrence, odor, office, olive, oppose, orange, orchard, ordinance, ornament, orthodox, orthoepy, outrage, outrageous, oxygen, pagan, pageantry, paint, painting, palace, palm, palsy, parade, parallel, paraphrase, parcel, parenthesis, partake, participle, partner, partridge, passive, paste, pastry, patch, patent, patience, patriot, patronage, pecuniary, pedagogue, pedigree, pelisse, peninsula, penitence, period, perish, perquisite, perseverance, persuade, peruse, pestilence, philanthropist, philology, piazza, picket, pierce, pillage, pious, pique, pith, plaice, planet, plaster, platoon, pleurisy, plunge, poison, polish, polysyllable, positive, potentate, poultice, poultry, pour, powder, power, precede, preface, prejudice, prescribe, preside, presume, pretend, prevent, prevention, priest, primary, primer, prince, privilege, procedure, prodigal, product, production, profane, profess, profligate, profound, prolong, prompt, prominent, pronoun, pronounce, propagate, property, prophesy, proscribe, prospect, protection, protestant, prove, proverb, provide, providence, province, provoke, prudence, prunello, pudding, pull, pulse, pulpit, punctual, punctuation, purchase, purify, purpose, pursue, pursuit, putrefy, putrid, quadruped, qualify, quarantine, quarto, quince, quire, quit, radiance, raindeer, random, ransom, rapid, rarefy, ratify, rational, ravage, ravel, rebuke, recede, receptacle, recline, recluse, recognize, recommend, recommendation, reconcile, recovery, rectify, reduce, reef, referee, refuge, refutation, regard, rejoice, relapse, relish, reluctance, rely, remember, remembrance, remittance, rendezvous, renounce, repentance, reprobate, repulse, repute, reputation, resemble, resent, resentment, reservation, resolute, resume, retard, revenge, reverence, reverend, revile, revolution, reward, rinse, rival, romance, root, rowel, rude, rush, rust, sacred, sacrifice, safe, salad, sanctify, sanction, sanctity, sarcenet, satiate, satire, satisfy, satyr, sausage, savage, savory, scaffold, scald, scale, scandal, scarce, scarlet, scatter, schooner, science, score, scoundrel, scourge, scrawl, secede, seclude, second, section, seduce, seethe, sentence, sequel, serene, servant, serve, service, servile, shatter, shawl, shell, shelve, shingle, shoe, shoot, shovel, shower, shrink, shuttle, siege, sieve, sigh, signal, silence, simplify, single, sink, sirup, size, sleave, slope, sluice, slumber, smuggle, snare, snath, snuff, soda, soder, sofa, sojourn, solid, solitude, solve, soot, sordid, spaniel, spasm, specie, spectacle, speech, spine, spire, splendid, spruce, squeeze, stagnant, stale, standard, starve, steed, steeple, stigma, stirrup, store, storm, straight, strange, strangle, stream, stump, sublime, subscribe, subside, subtile, succession, suburb, sudden, suffice, suffocate, suffrage, sulky, sullen, summon, superb, supersede, supply, suppose, supreme, surface, surprise, surrogate, surround, survivor, suspense, suspicion, swarm, swift, swingle, swivel, sword, sympathize, synod, syringe, tailor, taint, talon, tankard, taste, tattler, taught, telegraph, temperance, tempt, tense, terrace, testify, theft, through, tinge, tolerate, torpid, torrid, tortoise, toss, totter, touch, tough, towards, towel, tower, tradition, traduce, trance, transcribe, treasury, tremendous, trespass, trophy, tropic, trowel, trowsers, truce, true, truly, trustee, tuition, tung, turf, turkey, turnep, turnpike, twist, ugly, understand, undertake, uniform, union, unit, unity, universal, unripe, unroll, unruly, unsteady, upbraid, upwards, usual, utility, utter, utterance, vacate, vacation, vagabond, valve, vanquish, variance, various, vehemence, vendue, venerable, vengeance, venture, veracity, verdigris, verify, vestige, vilify, village, vindicate, viol, violence, violent, violet, violin, virgin, virginity, virtuous, visage, visible, vision, visitor, vivid, vote, vouch, vowel, voyage, vultur, wage, wagoner, wand, wanton, warden, warn, warp, wave, wedding, welcome, weld, whiffletree, wholesale, wicked, wife, windlass, wilt, wing, wire, with, withhold, without, withstand, wizard, woe, woman, word, world, worse, worsted, wrangle, wreck, wrench, wretch, wrist, writ, writing, wrung, yard, yesterday, yield, young, zodiac, zoology, &c. &c. &c. —about ONE THOUSAND WORDS are *not* to be found, any one of them, in any spelling lesson of the book!!!

Secondly:—and yet, such words as chump, page 23, coot, moot p. 30, gaff, doff, glyn p. 32, umber p. 35, podge, gorse p. 36, betony, scammony, lactary p. 41, dorsal, anil, fardel p. 41, ancillary, excretory corollary p. 52, palmetto p. 54, sleezy, sequent p. 58, decretal, farrago, advowson p. 59, tennis, flabby p. 61, polyglot p. 62, adjudicate, repudiate, tartareous p. 63, patulous, p. 67, nebulous, granulous, chamfer, mawkish p. 68, ostracism, pentagon p. 69, lixivial, quadrennial p. 76, lazaretto p. 81, etymon p. 82, propinquity, aridity, fecundity p. 90, catapult, mendicant p. 93, redolent p. 94, tangibility, jocularity, immobility p. 95, percolation p. 98, mortmain, vervain p. 104, stalactite, hortulan, protocol p. 106, incognito, orbicular p. 110, petroleum, cerulean p. 112, acetous, concavous p. 116, trochee, lachrymal, heptarchy p. 123, bronchotomy, toged p. 124, premonition, meretricious p. 128, druidic, hermetic, lucrific, scorbutic p. 129, eryngo, syringa p. 135, gnosticism, gnar, knout, knur p. 136, &c. &c. which are less used, and consequently a knowledge of their orthography of less importance, have been inserted to the exclusion of the preceding class; and others equally important which have been omitted by Mr. Ely!

Thirdly:—Mr. Ely has *omitted entire classes of words*, or he has inserted but few of them. He has not, in any of the spelling lessons, inserted one of the class of words ending in *ff*, which Mr. Webster spells with single *f* in his quarto and duodecimo dictionaries: thus, bailif, caitif, dandruf, mastif, plaintif, pontif, restif, sherif, undersherif, distaff, midrif, tarif, do *not* appear in the book. [Mr. Ely, in a communication, published in the New York Evening Post, Aug. 27, 1829, stated, that "They were in the manuscript which he wrote, and they must be inserted in the next edition of the spelling-book."!] But they have not yet been inserted. The class of words which end in *eed*, exceed, proceed, and succeed, (except that exceed is in a distinctive class of words p. 144), Mr. Ely has *not* inserted! Of the class of words which end in *re*, Mr. Ely has inserted but *four* in any of the spelling lessons! as, center p. 42, maneuver p. 59, ocher, sepulcher p. 123: but accoutre, amphitheatre, belleslettres, concentre, fibre, lustre, metre, mitre, sceptre, spectre, vertebre, ombre, petre, sabre, saltpetre, theatre and massacre, do *not* appear in the book! Of the large class of words, (about *one hundred* in number) which end in *tion* and *cian*, composed of *five* syllables, Mr. Ely has not, in any of the spelling lessons, inserted but *nine* of them! as, signification p. 138, exaggeration, refrigeration, solicitation, felicitation, imagination p. 126, arithmetician, academician, geometrician p. 128; but abbreviation, abomination, accentuation, accommodation, accumulation, administration, alleviation, annihilation, appropriation, association, articulation, assassination, anticipation, calumniation, classification, commiseration, communication, confederation, consideration, continuation, deliberation, delineation, denomination, discrimination, emancipation, fortification, humiliation, incorporation, insinuation, interrogation, investigation, justification, association, capitulation, enunciation, examination, participation, pronunciation, propitiation, renunciation, sanctification, mathematician, illumination, multiplication, qualification, retaliation, transfiguration, &c. &c. Mr. Ely has *omitted* entirely! Again, many of the words, in which, Mr. Webster, in his old spelling-book, pronounced *i* like *y*, he now pronounces differently, as Walker, Mr. Ely has *omitted;* as, follo, genial, genius, convenient, auxiliary, &c. &c. do *not* appear in the book!

Again: Mr. Ely has inserted a great many words, in the different spelling lessons, which are *not* in Mr. Webster's *duodecimo school dictionary, and many* of them are *not* in common or general use! This is a great objection, particularly as he has *omitted* many words in most common use! Thus, tah, gih, huh, lub, lac, sac, soc, sed, pid, tid, -, *lam, main p. 20, dum,* dan, kip p. 21, redd, mice, woke p. 22, sculp, lungs, baft p. 23, bast p. 24, [illegible], [illegible],

bret, brit p. 26, flook p. 30, slick, welk, ilk, hask p. 31, lusk, burl, dern, trass, cess p. 32, midge, gulch, batch, potch p. 36, neaf p. 39, beal p. 40, cutlery p. 41, awk p. 47, composite p. 53, militer p. 56, ponent p. 59, decrial, legumen, lumbago p. 59, classis, sentry p. 61, basket, wallet p. 65, bickern p. 68, capias, caries p. 70, frustrum, handbill p. 73, maintop, calix, p. 74, asseverate p. 76, suspire p. 77, permute p. 78, thane, ruth, meath, hath, thirl p. 84, bowline p. 85, turquois p. 88, turgidity, stupidity p. 90, appellatory p. 91, suppository, subserviency p. 92, illegibility, destructibility p. 93, discrepant, tolerant, sublunar p. 94, inadvertency, dictation p. 95, verberate p. 103, hemistich p. 106, causeway p. 107, imperceptibility, immalleability p. 113, plethory, urethra, acanthus, bibliothecal p. 114, tush, twixt p. 117, hithe p. 118, whilk p. 119, exustion p. 121, minious p. 122, achor, chimical p. 123, cogger, jogging, shrugging, lugging, fagged, fagging, gagged, gagging, bragged, wagged, sigil p. 125, mendacity, fictious p. 126, ambitious p. 127, acronic, sophistic, symmetric p. 129, analogic, astronomic, barometric, catechetic, categoric, chronologic, eremitic, exegetic, geologic, geometric, hypocritic, hyperbolic, hypothetic, periodic, philologic, theologic, typographic, zoographic p. 130, entomologic, genealogic, lexicographic, ornithologic, osteologic, physiologic, ichthyologic, hymnic, chimical, bismuthic, theoric p. 131, [on this page, 134, second column, containing *seven* words, *six* are *not* in Webster's school dictionary ¶ hulotheism, rationalism, scholasticism, dramatize p. 132, bestialize, cardinalize, citizenize, etherealize, gelatinize, meteorize, prodigalize, proselytize, vitriolize, cheverilize p. 133, sang, stringer, fangle p. 134, knarl p. 136, fascine p. 137, fallen, graven, loaden, slidden, striven, sunken p. 139, wreathen, forgotten, arisen, deaconess, diastole, hypallage p. 140, skittle, wimple p. 142, effable p. 143, beaux, does, says, womb p. 154, league p. 156.—amounting to ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY SIX WORDS—are *not* to be found in Webster's *school dictionary*, although Mr. Ely has inserted them in the Spelling-Book!

Fourthly:—Mr. Ely has, in the different spelling lessons, inserted the *same* word, *two* or *three* times! These defects will be particularly pointed out, however, when speaking of classification. From the foregoing exposition, it will be readily perceived that in consequence of the fewness of the words inserted by Mr. Ely in the spelling lessons of Mr. Webster's spelling-book, those scholars who use it will not become acquainted either with the orthography or pronunciation of a great portion of the most important words in our language, and consequently will find words in almost every sentence of their reading lessons, with the orthography or pronunciation of which they are wholly unacquainted, not having seen them in the spelling lessons of the same book! As, shell, oyster, gas, teacher p. 28, starry, careless, traveler, fowler, into, dancer, around, strive, wicked p. 29, science, image, likeness, contemptuous, service, theft, allowance, tillage, word, wickedness p. 42, single, degree, captain, exchange, because, above, body, judgment, seduce, justice p. 43, through, stove, yard p. 47, gambler, home, indorser, dignitary p. 49, country, himself, exercise, relish, children, famish p. 50, fragrance, drunkenness, poverty, obstinate, mineral, true, quadruped, worldly, primary, themselves, tipplers, difficult, devil p. 52, animal, information, writer, stream, contribute, oration, attend, hearer p. 53, library p. 112, nothing, covetous, rarely, suppose, demonstrably, false, divorce, husband, wife, incompatible, remarkable, generally, asbestos, sickly p. 113, &c. &c. are *not* in any of the *spelling* lessons of the book!

CLASSIFICATION.

The primary objects of arranging words in distinct classes, are, the designation of the vowel and consonant sounds, and the accentuation of syllables for the more ready acquirement of these by the learner. Classification and pronunciation are therefore in a great measure reciprocal, and much of the propriety or impropriety acquired in the latter, will depend upon the accuracy of the former. Hence this department should engage the most scrupulous attention, and accurate discrimination, in compiling a work for elementary instruction. In Mr. Webster's American Spelling-Book, the classification is governed by the number and accentuation of syllables, and the sounds of the vowels and consonants, with additional tables for irregular words, and words of distinctive definitions. In this, the Elementary Spelling-Book, Mr. Ely has, in addition to the former classification, classed the words according to their terminations. This addition does not appear to be an improvement on the former mode, being in many cases inapplicable, and seems to have led to the insertion of a great number of words in tables where the sound of the vowel or consonant is not given, and consequently can not be learned; and, to remedy which, these words must be again inserted in the tables, where the peculiar sound of the letter is designated, or their analogical pronunciation be wholly omitted. Again; Mr. Ely has inserted the *same* word *twice* or *three* times, in the *different* or *same* spelling lessons, through evident negligence, as the repetition of the word was not necessary to exhibit any peculiar vowel or consonant sound, not noted where the words first occur in the spelling lessons. Thus, page 20, 2d column, *fib* is inserted *twice* in the *same* column! Same page and column *gib* is wrongly classed, it should be on page 124 in which "*g* has its hard sound before *e*, *i*, and *y*." Same page seventh column *rid*, and it is inserted again in the *next* column! Same page eighth column *odd*, and it is inserted again on page 32! Same page thirteenth column *wig* is inserted *twice* in the same column! On page 21, fifth column *bin*, and it is inserted again on page 32, and again on page 146!! Same page fifteenth column, *get* is wrongly classed, it should be on page 124, where "*g* has its hard sound before *e*, *i*, and *y*." Same page twenty-third column *was*, and it is inserted again on page 55! On page 22, first column *jade*, and it is inserted again on page 42! Same page *take* is inserted *twice* in the seventh column! Same page twenty-second column *lane*, and it is again inserted on page 45, and again on page 147!! Same page and column *sane*, and it is inserted again on the *next* page sixth column! On page 23, first column *tine*, inserted again on page 47! Same page tenth column *gimp*, and eighteenth column *gift*, both wrongly classed, and they are both again inserted on page 124 where they *should* be with "words in which *g* is hard before *e*, *i*, and *y*!" Same page nineteenth column *tuft*, and it is inserted again on page 31! Same page twentieth column *gill*, in which *g* is hard before *i*, and it is inserted again on page 147! Same column *mill*, inserted again on page 45! Same page twenty-second column *grant* and *slant*, and they are *both* inserted again on page 47! On page 24 fourth column *hurt* and *shirt*, tenth column *cost* and *first*, and eleventh column *bust*; and *hurt*, *cost*, and *bust* are inserted again on page 32, and *shirt* and *first* on page 55!! On page 25 second column *cedar*, inserted again on page 57, and again on page 146!! Same page third column *wages*, and it is inserted again on page 74! Same column *tiger*, wrongly classed, and it is inserted again on page 124 where it *should* be with "words in which *g* is hard before *e*, *i*, and *y*!" Same column *seton*, wrongly classed, and it is inserted again on page 139 where it *should* be with "words in which *e*, *i*, and *o*, before *n*, are mute!"* Same page sixth column *oval*, and it is inserted again on page 37! On page 26 fourth column *sted*, and it is inserted again *differently* spelled (stead) on page 137! Same page sixth column *sham*, and it is inserted again on the *same* page *next* column! Same page thirteenth column *swop*, and it is inserted again *differently* spelled (swap) on page 47! On page 27 sixth column *scarf*, inserted again on page 47! Same page eighth column *rich*, inserted again on page 36! Same column *much*, inserted again on the *same* page eighteenth column! Same page fourteenth column *pouch*, inserted again on page 38! Same page eighteenth column *crush*, inserted again on page 117! On page 28 first column *ignite*, inserted again on page 78! Same page fourth column *devour*, inserted again on page 72! On page 29 eighth column *beer*, and it is inserted again *same* page *next* column, and again on page 146! Same page twelfth column *geese*, wrongly classed, and it is inserted again on page 124 where it *should* be with "words in which *g* is hard before *e*, *i*, and *y*!" On page 31 twelfth column *pink*, and it is inserted again on *same* page *next* column! On page 32 thirteenth column *frill*, and it is inserted again on *same* page *next* column! Same page twenty-first column *guess*, inserted again on page 45! On page 34 first column *spirit*, again on page 64! Same page second column *potash*, and again on page 49! On page 35 first column *shiver*, inserted again on page 56! Same page third column *gentry* and *sultry*, and they are *both* inserted again on page 61! Same column *giddy* wrongly classed, and it is inserted again on page 124 where it *should* be with "words in which *g* is hard before *e*, *i*, and *y*!" On page 37 eighth column *choir*, wrongly classed, and it is inserted again on page 123 where it *should* be with "words in which *c* before *h* has the sound of *k*!" Thus, the scholar, after he shall have learned the *orthography* of *choir* on p. 37, must pass nearly *one hundred* pages before he will know its *pronunciation!* Same page ninth column *noise* and *poise*, and they are *both* inserted again on the *next* page (38)! On page 38 first column *sprout*, and again on the *same* page sixth column! On page 42 fifth column *flake*, and it is inserted again on the *same* page *next* column! On page 43 first column *tester*, second column *elder*, and third column *tinder*; and all *three* of them are inserted again on page 56! On page 44 first column *clapper*, inserted again on page 56! Same page second column *lentil*, and it is inserted again *same* page *next* column! Same column *revel*, inserted again on page 72! On page 47 twelfth column *state*, and again *same* page *next* column! On page 48 first column *dignity*, wrongly classed, inserted again where it *should* be on page 138! Same page third column *usury*, wrongly classed, should be on page 122 with words in which *s* has the sound of *zh*! (This word is pronounced uzury, "s as z" in the quarto dictionary, but in the octavo, a *later* work, he has it uzhury, s like zh!) On page 49 first column, *incitement* and *excitement*, and they are *both* inserted again on page 101! Same page third column *enlightenment*,

* Thus the scholar or teacher will not know until he shall have passed more than one hundred pages that *e* is silent in *seton*.

wrongly classed, it should be on page 114 where the sound of *th* is noted, and the scholar will not know until he shall arrive at page 114 whether *th* have the "aspirated" or "vocal" sound, and only then by seeing the primitive word *enthrall* in which the sound is noted! Same column *amusement*, inserted again on page 102! On page 50 second column *symbol*, it is inserted again on page 73, and again on page 147! Same page third column *statute*, inserted again on page 108! Same page fourth column *ingrate*, inserted again on page 88! Same page seventh column *triumph*, inserted again on page 148! On page 51 first column *nugatory*, inserted again on the *next* page (52)! Same column *necessary*, wrongly classed, should be on page 125 with words in which "*c* accented or ending a syllable, has the sound of *s*!" Same page second column *exemplary*, wrongly classed, it is inserted again on page 120 where it *should* be with words in which "*x* passes into the sound of *gz*!" Thus, the scholar will pass *seventy* pages of the book after learning the *orthography* of *exemplary* before he will know its *pronunciation!* Same page third column *adversary*, inserted again on the *next* page (52)! On page 52 second column *presbytery*, and it is inserted again on page 67! Here on page 52 *presbytery* is classed with words which have "the primary accent on the first and the secondary on the third;" and on page 67 it is classed with words "accented on the first" only! Same column *predatory*, inserted again on the *same* column! Same page third column *legislative, legislature, legislator*, all wrongly classed, should be on page 126 with words in which "*g* ending a syllable, has the sound of *j*!" as *vegetate*, &c. On page 54 third column *inclosure, disclosure, composure, exposure*, and *foreclosure*, all wrongly classed, should be on page 122 in which *s* has the sound of *zh!* These five words are *all* pronounced, *s* as *zh*, in the octavo, but in the quarto *disclosure* and *composure* only are so pronounced! *exposure* and *foreclosure* "*s* as *z*!" and *inclosure* is given without any notation *how* the *s* shall be pronounced! In the duodecimo the *s*, in all of them, is noted to represent *z!* and here Mr. Ely has them without any notation whether "*s* as *z*," or as *zh!* On page 55 tenth column *lair*, inserted again on *same* page thirteenth column! Same page seventeenth column *give*, wrongly classed, and it is inserted again on page 124 where it *should* be, with "words in which *g* is hard before *e, i*, and *y*!" On page 58 second column *barefoot*, wrongly classed, should be on page 111 with words in which *bare, care*, &c. &c. are inserted! On page 60 second column *disenthrall*, wrongly classed, should be on page 114 where enthrall is inserted with the sound of *th* noted! Same page third column *overwhelm*, wrongly classed, should be on page 119 with words in which "*h* is pronounced before *w*," where *whelm* is inserted! Thus, the scholar will pass more than *fifty* pages after learning the *orthography* of *overwhelm* before he will know its pronunciation! On page 61 first column *auctioneer*, wrongly classed, should be on page 127 with "words in which *ce, ci, ti*, and *si*, are pronounced as *sh*!" Same page second column *financier, brigadier, grenadier*, and *bombardier*, wrongly classed, they should be on page 137 with *cavalier, chevalier, cashier*, &c. &c.! Same page third column *coexist* and *preexist*, wrongly classed, should be on page 120 with words in which "*x* passes into the sound of *gz*," where *exist* is inserted! Thus, the scholar will pass *sixty* pages after learning the *orthography* of *coexist* and *preexist* before he will know their *pronunciation!* Same column *overthrow*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 84 or 114 with words in which the sound of *th* is noted, where *throw* is inserted! On page 62 first column *compliment*, it is inserted again on page 94, and again on page 118! On page 63 sixth column *luxuriant*, wrongly classed, should be on page 120 with words in which "*x* passes into the sound of *gz*," where *exuberant*, &c. are inserted, and the *x* is followed by an accented syllable beginning with a vowel. On page 64 first column *falcon*, wrongly classed, should be on page 139 with "words in which *e, i*, and *o*, before *n*, are mute!" Same page third column *congress*, wrongly classed, should be on page 134 with words in which "the sound of *ng* is close!" Same page second column *dolphin*, inserted again on page 101! On page 65 third column *gimblet*, wrongly classed, and it is inserted again on page 124 where it *should* be with "words in which *g* has its hard sound before *e, i*, and *y*!" On page 66 *forgetful*, should be on page 125, where *g* is hard before *e!* On page 67 first column *vegetative*, wrongly classed, should be on page 126 with words in which "*g* ending a syllable, has the sound of *j*," where *vegetate*, &c. are inserted! Same page second column *visionary*, wrongly classed, it should be on page 123 with words in which "the terminating syllable is pronounced *zhun*," where *division*, &c. are inserted! Same column *missionary, dictionary*, and *stationary*, all wrongly classed, they should be on page 126 with "words in which *ce, ci, ti*, and *si*, are pronounced as *sh*!" Same page third column *casuistry*, wrongly classed, should be on page 122 with words in which *s* is pronounced as *zh!* [It *is* pronounced *s* as *zh* in Webster's *octavo* dictionary.] On page 68 fourth column *sanguine*, wrongly classed, should be on page 134 with words in which "the sound of *ng* is close," where *languish*, &c. are inserted! Same page fifth column *spendthrift*, wrongly classed, should be on page 114 with words in which the sound of *th* is noted! Same column *surfeit*, inserted again *same* page seventh column! Same page seventh column *garden*, inserted again on page 73! On page 69 first column *gallicism*, inserted again on page 132 with "words ending in *ism*!" On page 70 second column *countersign*, inserted again on page 128 with words in which "*g* is silent!" On page 71 first column *begin*, second column *beget* and *forget*, all three wrongly classed, should be on page 125 with "words in which *g* has its hard sound before *e, i*, and *y*!" *begin is* inserted again on page 125 where it *should* be, but *beget* and *forget* are *not* there inserted! Same column *within*, wrongly classed, should be on page 115 with "words in which *th* have their vocal sound!" Same page second column *beset*, inserted again on page 100! On page 72 third column *withdraw*, inserted again on page 83, wrongly classed in *both* places, should be on page 115 with "words in which *th* have their vocal sound!" Same page eighth column *mongrel*, wrongly classed, it is inserted again on page 135 with words in which "the sound of *ng* is close," where it *should* be! Thus, the scholar will pass more than *sixty* pages after learning the *orthography* of *mongrel* before he will know its *pronunciation!* On page 74 second column *shoulder*, inserted again on page 88! On page 77 second column *prognosticate*, inserted again on page 111, and is differently divided (prognostic-ate prognosti-cate!) Same column *authenticate*, wrongly classed, should be on page 114 with words in which the sound of *th* is noted! Same page third column *executive*, wrongly classed, and it is inserted again on page 120 where it *should* be with words in which "*x* passes into the sound of *gz*!" Thus, the scholar will pass more than *forty* pages after learning the *orthography* of *executive* before he will know its *pronunciation*, that is, that *x* has the sound of *gz* in it! On page 78 third column *opake*, and it is inserted again on page 156, and *differently* spelled (opaque!) On page 79 third column *dethrone* and *enthrone*, wrongly classed, should be on page 114 with words in which the sound of *th* is noted! Same column *declare, insnare, prepare*, and *compare*, all wrongly classed, and they are *all* inserted again on p. 141 where they *should* be, and *ensnare*, differently spelled! Same p., fourth column *brevier*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 137 with *dernier, frontier*, &c.! On p. 81, *braggadocio* and *internuncio* wrongly classed, should be on p. 127, with "words in which *ce, ci, ti*, and *si*, are pronounced as *sh*"! Same p. second column, *metaphysics*, inserted again on p. 130! Same column *mathematics*, again on p. 130, wrongly classed in *both* places, should be on p. 114, with words in which the sound of *th* is noted, where *mathematical* is inserted! Same column *preexistent* and *coexistent*, both wrongly classed, should be on p. 120, with words in which "*x* passes into the sound of *gz*," where *exist* is inserted! The scholar can *not* learn the pronunciation of these words until he shall arrive at p. 120! Same column, *overshadow*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 86, where *shadow* is inserted! Same column *regimental*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 125, with words in which "*g* ending a syllable, has the sound of *j*," where *regiment* is inserted! On p. 83, sixth column *withal*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 115, where the sound of *th* is noted! On p. 84, third column, *thrill* is inserted *twice* in the *same* column! Same column *thought*, inserted again on p. 156! Same column, *throng, thing* and *thong*, and *thing* and *thong* are inserted again on p. 134! On p. 85, third column *thursday* and *pathway*, both wrongly classed, should be on p. 114, where the sound of *th* is noted; *thursday* is inserted again on p. 114, but *pathway* is not! On p. 87, first column *rasure* and *seizure*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 122, where the *s* and *z* have the sound of *zh*, as *grazier, fusion*, &c.! Same column *ancient*, wrongly classed, it is inserted again on p. 127, where it *should* be with "words in which *ce, ci, ti*, and *si*, are pronounced, as *sh*"! Thus, the scholar, after learning the *orthography* of *ancient*, must pass *forty* pages of the book before he will know its pronunciation! Same p. second column *careful*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 141, where *care, declare*, &c. are inserted! Same column *faithful* and *youthful*, and third column *thralldom*, all three wrongly classed, should be on p. 114, where the sound of *th* is noted! On page 88, first column *pleasure, measure*, and *treasure*, all wrongly classed, should be on p. 122, with words in which *s* has the sound of *zh*, as *hosier*, &c.! Same column *censure, pressure*, and *fissure*, all wrongly classed, should be on p. 126, where *c, t*, and *s*, have the sound of *sh!* [S has the sound of *sh* in all these words in Webster's octavo dictionary, and in *censure* and *fissure* in the *quarto*, but *none* of them are so pronounced in the *duodecimo!*] *Pleasure, measure*, and *treasure*, are inserted again on p. 137, with words in which "the vowel *a* of the digraph *ea*, has no sound, and *e* is short, but it is not there stated that *s* has the sound of *zh!* On page 89, first column, *significant*, inserted again on page 138! On page 90, first column, *integrity*, inserted again on page 109! On page 92, first column *imaginary* and *unnecessary*, both wrongly classed, should be on p. 126, with words in which "*c* accented or ending a syllable, has the sound of *s*, and *g* that of *j*," as *imagination*, &c. on that page! Same column *confectionary*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 126, with "words in which *ce, ci, ti*, and *si*, are pronounced as *sh*"! On p. 93, *illegibility* and *flagelet*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 126, with words in which "*g*, ending a syllable, has the sound of *j*," as *legible, fragile*, &c. on that page! On p.

94, second column *insular*, and it is inserted again on the *same* p. *next* column! On p. 95, *superfluity* occurs *twice* in the *same* column! Same p. second column *sociability*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 127, with "words in which *ce*, *ci*, *ti*, and *si*, are pronounced as *sh*," where *social*, &c. are inserted! Same column *singularity*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 134, with words in which "the sound of *ng* is close"! On page 100, first column *misgive* and *forgive*, both wrongly classed, should be on p. 124, with "words in which *g* has its hard sound before *e*, *i*, and *y*," where *give* is inserted! Same p. fourth column *adopt* is inserted *twice* in the *same* column! Same column *among* and *belong*, both wrongly classed, should be on p. 134, with words in which *ng* have "the open sound of *ng*;" *among* is inserted again on p. 134, where it *should* be, but *belong* is *not*, although *long* is on that p. (134!) On p. 103, second column *passionate*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 126, with "words in which *ce*, *ci*, *ti* and *si*, are pronounced as *sh*," or it should be on p. 108, where *passion* is inserted! On page 104, fifth column *staggers*, wrongly classed, it is inserted again on p. 125, where it *should* be, with "words in which *g* has its hard sound before *e*, *i*, and *y*"! Same p. seventh column *zealous* and *jealous*, wrongly classed, they are both inserted again on p. 137, where they *should* be, with words in which "the vowel *a* of the digraph *ea*, has no sound, and *e* is short"! On p. 105, third column *ingot*, wrongly classed, it is inserted again on p. 134, where it *should* be, with words in which "the sound of *ng* is close"! Same p. fourth column *zealot*, wrongly classed, it is inserted again on p. 137, where it *should* be! On p. 106, first column *hemistich*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 123, with "words in which *c* before *h* has the sound of *k*"! On p. 107 third column *hawthorn*, and fifth column *something*, both wrongly classed, should be on p. 114, where the sound of *th* is noted! Same p. seventh column, *headlong* wrongly classed, should be on p. 137, where *head* is inserted! On p. 108, first column *headache*, *toothache*, and *heartache*, all wrongly classed, should be on p. 123, with "words in which *c* before *h* has the sound of *k*," where *ache* is inserted! Same column *pregnant*, wrongly classed, inserted again on p. 133, where it should be! Same p. second column *pleasant* and *peasant*, wrongly classed, inserted again on p. 137, where they should be, with words in which "the vowel *a* of the digraph *ea* has no sound, and *e* is short"! Same p. third column *dayspring* wrongly classed, should be on page 134, where *spring* is inserted! On p. 109, first column *theocracy*, *philanthropy*, and *misanthropy*, all wrongly classed, inserted again on p. 114, where they *should* be, where the sound of *th* is noted! but *philanthropy* is differently divided on p. 114, thus phi-lanthropy (109) phil-anthropy (114!) On p. 110 first column *traditional*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 127, with "words in which *ci* and *ti* are pronounced as *sh*, and are united to the preceding syllable," where *addition*, &c. are inserted! Same column *intentional*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 127, with "words in which *ce*, *ci*, *ti* and *si*, are pronounced as *sh*"! Same p. second column *exordium*, wrongly classed, it is inserted again on p. 120, where it should be with words in which "*x* passes into the sound of *gz*"! Thus, the scholar, after learning the *orthography* of *exordium* will pass *ten* pages before he will know its pronunciation, viz. that *x* has the sound of *gz* in it! On p. 111, first column *triangular*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 134 where *angular* is inserted with words in which "the sound of *ng* is close"! Same p. second column *epitomize*, *apostatize*, and *immortalize*, all wrongly classed, should be on p. 133, with "words ending in *ize*"! Same p. third column *occasional*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 122, where *occasion* is inserted with words in which *s* has the sound of *zh*! Here on p. 111 the scholar can *not* learn how to pronounce *occasional* until he shall arrive at p. 122, where the pronunciation of the primitive word *occasion* is given! Same column *irrational* and *proportional* wrongly classed, should be on p. 127, where "*ce*, *ci*, *ti* and *si*, are pronounced as *sh*"! Same p. fourth column *exhilarate*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 120, with words in which "*x* passes into the sound of *gz*"! Thus, the scholar can *not* learn the pronunciation of this word any where in the book! Same column *originate*, wrongly classed, inserted again on p. 126, where it *should* be, but *differently* divided, thus, *origi-nate* (111) *orixin-ate* (126!) Same p. fifth column *exasperate*, wrongly classed, inserted again on p. 120, where it *should* be, but *differently* divided, thus *exasper-ate* (111,) *exaspe-rate* (120!) On p. 112 first column *compassionate*, *dispassionate*, and *affectionate*, all wrongly classed, should be on p. 127, where "*ce*, *ci*, *ti* and *si*, are pronounced as *sh*"! Same p. third column *leviathan*, wrongly classed, inserted again on p. 114, where it *should* be, with the sound of *th* noted! Same p. fourth column *erorious*, fifth column *luxurious*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 120, with words in which "*x* passes into the sound of *gz*," as the *x* is followed by an accented syllable beginning with a vowel, as in *exordium*, *exuberant*, &c. p. 120! On p. 114 first column *thistle*, inserted again on p. 143, with words in which *t* is silent! Thus, the scholar will not know that *t* before *le* is silent in *thistle* when he learns its orthography on p. 114! Same column next word *throstle*, *t* is also silent, but *throstle* is not inserted again on p. 143, so that the scholar will never learn in the Spelling-Book that *t* is silent in *throstle*! Same column *throttle*, inserted again on p. 143! Same column *authorize*, inserted again on p. 132, with "words ending in *ize*"! Same column *thimble*, inserted again on p. 142! Same p. second column *cathotic* and *plethoric*, inserted again on p. 131! Same column *authentic* and *pathetic*, third column *athletic* and *cathartic*, all inserted again on p. 129! Same column *atheistic* and *arithmetic*, inserted again on p. 130, and both differently divided! Same column *methodical*, again on p. 131! Same column *polytheism*, again on p. 132! Same column *ichthyology*, again on p. 124! On p. 115, first column *clothier*, inserted again on p. 121! [All this repetition of words in the different lessons might have been avoided, had the system of classification been consistent and judicious. Thus, the word *clothier*, &c. in which there are two consonant sounds to be noted, the words should have been in the class of "Words of irregular orthography," on p. 154, where both peculiar sounds could have been noted by spelling the pronunciation of the words, as he has done on that page.] Same column *whither* and *whether* inserted again on p. 111! Same column *leather* and *feather*, again on p. 137! Same p. second column *burthen*, again on p. 138, with "words in which *e*, *i*, and *o* before *n* are mute," although the *e* is italick on p. 115, denoting that it is "mute"! Same p. third column *together*, again on p. 125! Same p. fifth column *distinguish*, sixth column *extinguish*, wrongly classed, should be on p. 134 with words in which "the sound of *ng* is close," where *languish*, &c. are inserted! On p. 118, fifth column *chasm*, wrongly classed, it is inserted again on p. 123, where it should be, with "words in which *c* before *h* has the sound of *k*"! On p. 119 first column *whitex*, inserted again on p. 140! Same p. third column *whiffle* and fourth column *whistle* and *whittle*, all inserted again on p. 143! Same p. sixth column *whoopingcough*, wrongly classed, it should *not* be in this lesson, for there is no *w* in the word in any of Mr. Webster's Dictionaries, or in the dictionaries of Johnson or Walker! On p. 120 second column *exaggerate*, inserted again on p. 126, and is *differently* divided, thus, *exagge-rate* (120) *exagger-ate* (126!) Same p. third column, *exotic*, again on p. 131. On p. 121 first column *christian*, again on p. 123! same p. third column *exhaustion* and *exustion*. What sound has *x* in these words? Mr. Ely has told us in his "Analysis of sounds in the English Language," that *x* is sometimes pronounced as *gz*," but *why* it is so pronounced he has *not* informed us! whether because it is followed by an accented syllable beginning with a vowel or not. On page 122 third column *seraglio*, it is inserted again on p. 155, and is *differently* divided! thus, *seragl-io* (122,) *serag-lio* (155!) On p. 122 first column *ache*, inserted again on p. 154! Same p. second column *cholic*, wrongly classed, it should *not* be in this lesson, for there is no *h* in the word in any of Webster's dictionaries, or in the dictionaries of Johnson and Walker! Same column *scirrous*, inserted with "words in which *c* before *h* has the sound of *k*," and there is no *h* in the word! Same p. sixth column *chimical*, inserted again on p. 131! On page 124 *mechanic* and *scholastic*, again on p. 129! Same column *chaotic*, again on p. 131! Same p. second column *synecdoche*, again on p. 140! Same p. seventh column *giggle*, again on p. 142! On p. 125, first column *waggish*, inserted again on the *same* p. *next* column! [In the first edition of this book, published in New York, *sluggard*, was inserted; in which *g* did *not* come before *e* or *i*; but the *blunder* was pointed out by a writer in the New York Courier and Inquirer, Sept. 9, 1829, and *sluggard* has been *struck* out, and *waggish* inserted in its place, although it was in the lesson before!] Same p. third column *goggle*, wrongly classed, for *g* does *not* come "before *e*, *i*, or *y*" in the word! It is inserted again on p. 142! Same p. fourth column *girdle*, again on p. 142! Same p. fifth column *magic* and *tragic*, again on p. 129! On p. 126 first column *logic*, again on p. 128! Same p. third column *rhinoceros*, again on p. 155! On pages 97, 126, 127, and 128, are words in which *c*, *s*, and *t*, have the sound of *sh*.

In these lessons the terminations *sion*, *tion*, *cial*, *sial*, *cian*, *cious*, *tious*, *ciate* and *tiate* are intermingled in such a manner that the scholar can not determine, when required to spell any word contained in these lessons, whether to use *c*, *t*, or *s*, the sound being the same: as *pension*, *mention*, *suspicion*, *emaciate*, *ingratiate*, &c.; and it is evident that the words in which *t*, *c*, and *s* have the sound of *sh*, should be classed in separate lessons for the same reasons that he has classed the words in which *ch* has the sound of *sh* and *k*; as we learn their *pronunciation* by association, so should we learn the *orthography* of the other words referred to. On page 128 fifth column *noxious* inserted with "words in which *ce*, *ci*, *ti* and *si* are pronounced as *sh*," when there is no *ce*, *ci*, *ti*, or *si* in the word! On page 127 fourth column *delicious*, and it is inserted again on the *same* p. sixth column! Same column *afflicious*, fifth column *fruition*, and they are *both* inserted again on p. 128! On page 128 *arithmetician*, *ethic*, and *ethnic* are so classed that the scholar will *not* know what sound *th* has in them, as they are not on p. 114 or 115 where the different sounds of *th* are noted! On p. 129 second column phthisic, again on p. 155! Same p. fifth column *alchimic*, wrongly classed, should have been on p. 123 with "words in which *c* before *h* has the sound of *k*"! [In this classification of the words ending in ic, Mr. Ely was not consistent or uniform;

thus, he has *catholic, athletic*, on p. 114, *mechanic* on p. 124, inserted where the sounds of *th* and *ch* are noted, and repeated here: but he has *synthetic*, p. 114, *chronic*, p. 123, &c. *not* repeated here in words ending in *ic*; and, again he has *alchimic*, p. 129, *orthographic*, p. 130, *choleric*, p. 131, which are *not* on pages 114, 115, or 123, or 124, where the sounds of *th* and *ch* are noted!!! Same column *ecstatic*, inserted again on p. 131, and *differently* spelled! same p. seventh column *pneumatic*, again on p. 155! Same column *rhetoric*, again on p. 155 differently *divided* and *accented*, thus, *rhe-tor-ic* (129), *rhet-o-ric* (155)!! On page 130 *alchimistic, analogic, casuistic, catechetic, chronologic, eucharistic, geologic, hypothetic, mythologic, mathematic, orthographic, pantheistic, parenthetic, pathologic, philologic, philanthropic, pyrotechnic, sympathetic, theologic, theocratic, theoretic, theoretic, zoologic* p. 131, *characteristic, enthusiastic, entomologic, genealogic, ornithologic, ostrologic, physiologic, ichthyologic, gothic, chimerical, illogical, whimsical, bismuthic, choleric, theoric* p. 132, *gothicism, provincialism, catholicism, monotheism, hylotheism, rationalism, scholasticism* p. 133, *methodize, theorize, anathematize, bestialize, catholicize, characterize, etherealize, nationalize, cheverilize*, have been inserted on these pages without any rule having been given, by Mr. Ely, for the pronunciation of *ch, th, s, wh*, and *s*, which occur in them! Thus, the scholar who consults the spelling-book *only*, will for ever remain unacquainted with their pronunciation! while *athematic, atheistic, chaotic, exotic, polythelism, authorize*, &c. which occur on the *same* pages *have* been inserted on pages 114, 124, 130, &c. where the sounds of *th, ch, s*, &c. are noted! Hence Mr. Ely has every species of *inconsistency* imaginable, in the classification of the words on pages 130, 131, 132, and 133!

On page 132 fifth column *anglicism*, inserted again on p. 131 with words in which "the sound of *ng* is close"! On page 133 third column *exercise*, is inserted with "words ending in *ize*," but *exercise* has *not* any *z* in it in *any* of Mr. Webster's dictionaries, or in the dictionaries of Johnson, Walker, &c.! On p. 137 second column *buccaneer*, with words in which "*ch* has the sound of *sh*, and *i* has the sound of *e* long," but *buccaneer* has no *ch* or *i* in it! and should be on p. 81, with *governor, volunteer*, &c. Same p. fourth column *breadth, breath, earth, dearth, threat*, fifth column *health, wealth, stealth*, sixth column *healthy, wealthy, feather, leather, lethern*, seventh column *threaten* with words in which "the vowel *a* of the digraph *ea*, has no sound, and *e* is short." Only *two* of these words (*feather* and *leather*) are inserted on pages 114, or 115 where the different sounds of *th* are noted, (all the others are here inserted on p. 137 without the sound of *th* being noted, so that their pronunciation can *not* be learned in any lesson contained in the spelling book.) Same p. sixth column *heaven* and *leaven*, seventh column *threaten*, inserted again on p. 139! On page 139, *earthen, given, strengthen, lengthen, thicken* p. 140, *wreathen, wheaten, forgiven, christen*, p. 142, *wheedle*, p. 144, *sociable, tithable*, have been inserted without any rule for the pronunciation of *th, wh, g, ch, c*, which occur in them! while *whitten, headache* p. 140, *thimble, giggle* p. 142, *whiffle, whittle, thistle, whistle* p. 143, *have* been inserted on pages 119, 124, 114, where the sounds of *th, wh, g, ch*, &c. *are* noted! The preceding classification is a great *inconsistency*, entirely void of uniformity! On p. 141 sixth column *hazle* is inserted with "words in which *e* final after *l* is mute;" but *e* is *not* final in *hazel* in *any* of Mr. Webster's dictionaries, or in the dictionaries of Johnson or Walker! The word is, therefore, wrongly classed.

On the last part of page 144, and the first part of page 145, Mr. Ely has given a class of "words nearly, but not exactly alike in pronunciation." Of these he has given *eighty-seven*; and, he might with as much propriety, have given *five hundred* other words in the language, as these *eighty-seven*; for the pronunciation of these is no more "nearly, but not exactly alike," than *hundreds* of others in the language! that is, agreeably to the pronunciation of Mr. Webster's *dictionary*. Although Mr. Ely has stated that these "words" are "nearly" alike in pronunciation, yet he has *not* given the *pronunciation* of any of them in this lesson; and he has not, in any of the preceding spelling lessons, given more than *forty-nine* of these words; and, consequently the scholar will never know from the use of this spelling-book, how to pronounce these *thirty eight* words which Mr. Ely says are "nearly, but not exactly alike in pronunciation," not knowing *what* that "*pronunciation*" is! as, are, accept, except, accede, exceed, acre, allusion, acts, ax, ally, allowed, errand, errant, ballad, ballot, clothes, close, consort, dost, immerge, emerge, gesture, jester, idol, impostor, imposture, naughty, ingenious, pint, raddish, reddish, slake, since, sense, tenure, talents, talons, and value, are *not* pronounced in any spelling lesson of the book! but, air p. 45, affect, effect p. 71, achor 123, access, excess p. 75, illusion, elusion p. 122, alley p. 34, assay p. 28, essay p. 85, affusion, effusion p. 122, aloud p. 72, arrant p. 108, addition, edition p. 127, ballot p. 34, creak p. 39, creek p. 29, concert p. 85, descent, dissent p. 71, decease p. 78, disease p. 83, dust p. 24, elicit, illicit p. 126, earn p. 137, urn p. 23, fat, vat p. 21, harsh p. 27, hash p. 117, idle p. 143, knotty p. 136, ingenuous p. 89, morse p. 36, moss p. 32, line p. 22, loin p. 37, loom p. 30, loam p. 40, medal p. 56, meddle p. 142, point p. 37, slack p. 31, tenor p. 43, valley p. 34, *are* pronounced on the preceding pages! Some of these words here given as being "*nearly*" alike in pronunciation, are very distinctly *different*; as *air* (*a* long,) *are* (*a* flat,) as distinctly different sounds as any two in the language! *Are* is not *pronounced* in the Spelling-Book, neither is the word to be found in Webster's school dictionary, but in his quarto he says "it is usually pronounced *ar*" (*a* flat,) and in his octavo he *does* pronounce it *ar* (*a* flat!) *alley* and *ally* are differently accented! *decease* and *disease*; *e* long in the first syllable, and *s* sharp in *decease*, but, *i* short in the first syllable, and *s* like *z* in both syllables in *disease*, *not* very "nearly alike" in pronunciation! *dost* and *dust*; *dost* is not *pronounced* in the Spelling-Book, or in Webster's quarto dictionary, and the word is not *to be found* in Webster's school dictionary, which is, of course, *to be used* with the Spelling-Book; but in Webster's *octavo* dictionary, it *is* pronounced with *o* like *u* short, so that these two words p. 145, *dost* and *dust* are not "*nearly*" but "*exactly*" alike, if Mr. Webster's octavo dictionary be the "STANDARD!!" *pint* (*i* long) *point* (*oi* diphthong,) these are *not* very "nearly alike in pronunciation!" &c. &c. &c.

On page 145, Mr. Ely has given a class of "words of the same orthography, but differently pronounced!" Of this class of words, there are in the language, (acknowledged by Mr. Webster in his dictionaries,) about *one hundred and sixteen*, that is, differently *accented* and *pronounced*, when differently applied. Of these, Mr. Ely has classed but *twenty-one*, in this lesson p. 145! We might *reasonably* suppose that Mr. Ely would insert *all* of these words, subject to different pronunciation or accentuation when differently applied, if *any*, in a lesson of this kind p. 145; for, the scholar would, most unquestionably, conclude, when looking at the title of this lesson, that Mr. Ely has classed *all* of them; and, with this conclusion, would for ever remain ignorant of the fact, from the use of this lesson, that there are in the language, NINETY-FIVE *other* "*words of the same orthography, but differently pronounced*" or accented, similar to the TWENTY-ONE which he *has* classed! Again, Mr. Ely has, in the preceding lessons, intermingled NINE of these *ninety-five* words with their different accentuation or pronunciation noted; as, *concert* pages 85 and 144, *contest* pp. 35 and 76, *contract* pp. 68 and 71, *ferment* pp. 71 and 105, *object* and *subject* pp. 64 and 71, *rebel* pp. 44 and 100, *refuse* pp. 83 and 88, *sore* pp. 45, 56, and 149, which are not here classed, on p. 145! and the SIXTY-ONE following words are inserted with only *one* accentuation or pronunciation noted, neither can we learn from his spelling-book that they *ever should be* differently accented or pronounced! as, concrete, convoy p. 28, house, mouse p. 36, use p. 37, close pp. 37 and 144, rise pp 37 and 149, gout p. 38, grease p. 39, attribute p. 48, minute p. 50, frequent p. 58, overflow, overthrow p. 61, abject, instinct, progress p. 64, descant p. 68, countermarch p. 70, prefix, augment, abstract, affix, extract, insult, traject, coliect, conduct, conflict, project, compact p. 71, impress p. 75, digest, import, transport, escort, comport, desert, contrast, convert, protest p. 76, retail p. 78, supine confine, console p. 79, abuse, excuse, diffuse p. 83, transfer, conserve, converse p. 100, torment p. 104, absent, present, convent p. 105, accent p. 108, exile p. 120, precedent p. 125, raven p. 139, consort p. 144, lead p. 148, are inserted with but *one* accentuation or pronunciation in any of the spelling lessons of the book! Again; there are TWENTY-FIVE *other* words of this class, subject to different accentuation or different pronunciation when differently applied, of which the scholar will for ever remain ignorant unless he shall refer to some other source than the *Elementary* Spelling-Book, as they are *not* in any of the spelling lessons with *either* accentuation or pronunciation!! as, foretaste, presage, export, bombard, discord, record, colleague, produce, cement, incense, undress, discount, confect, compress, complot, compound, countermine, countermand, misconduct, disuse, put, &c. &c. and these words which Mr. Ely has *entirely omitted* are as important as those he has *inserted*! Several of the preceding class of words are pronounced or accented but *one* way in Mr. Webster's *duodecimo* dictionary, but are *two* ways in Mr. Webster's *octavo* dictionary! As perfume, bombard, discord, colleague, abject, entrance, discount, confect, instinct, mouse, and frequent. The word entrance is spelled with *s*, when a verb, in Mr. Webster's quarto, but with *c* in his octavo! In his duodecimo published in 1830, he spelled it with *c*, agreeing with the octavo; but in the edition published in 1831, it is spelled entranse with *s*, agreeing with the quarto! Thus if we take the *octavo* or *duodecimo* of 1830, for the standard, entrance, verb and noun, *should* be in this lesson, as spelled alike, differently accented; but if we take the *quarto* or *duodecimo* of 1831 for the standard, they should *not* be in this lesson, being spelled differently! [Surely Mr. Ely would have been in a dilemma relative to the orthography of this word had he *not* used "*Walker's Rhyming Dictionary, London edition*, 1824," *when classing these words!*]

On pages 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, and 150, Mr. Ely has given a lesson of "*Words pronounced alike, but different in orthography*." This is one of the most important lessons contained in any Spelling-Book; for, unless these *words are associated with their respective distinctive definitions*, it is impossible for the scholar to become ac-

quainted with their *orthography*, their *pronunciation* being alike. From the title of this lesson, and its evident importance in a Spelling-Book, we might *reasonably* expect that Mr. Ely *had* inserted *all* the common words of this class in the language; that he had *not* inserted any of these words in the preceding spelling lessons where the distinctive definitions are *not* given, as it is *impossible* for the scholar to distinguish the spelling of words which are pronounced alike, but spelled differently, when they are intermingled with other words, and *not* associated with their *distinctive* definitions. And we might also expect that their pronunciation would be given in this lesson; and that no words would be here classed which are *not* pronounced alike: yet, this lesson is *defective* in all the preceding, and in some other particulars, as will be fully shown.

First:—There are acknowledged by Mr. Webster, either in his spelling-book or dictionary, about *seven hundred and eighty* words of this class; yet Mr. Ely has classed in this lesson only *four hundred and forty-six*, of which *he* says two or more are sounded alike, but few more than *half* in the language.

Secondly:—There are *two hundred and ninety-three* of these *four hundred and forty-six* words, intermingled in the preceding and following spelling lessons, where their distinctive definitions are *not* given, which, as a matter of prudence, should not be inserted *twice* to the exclusion of other words in common and general use:

As ail page 40, ale page 22, air pages 45 and 144, heir page 45, alter page 107, ant page 23, ark page 31, ascent page 108, (where it is *differently* accented!) auger page 125, bail page 10, bale page 22, ball page 32, bawl page 47, base page 22, beer page 29, (*twice* on that page!) bier page 45, bin page 21, and again on page 32! berry page 61, bury page 151, beat page 45, beet page 29, blew page 45, blue page 39, boar page 45, bore page 22, bow pages 53 and 145, bow page 45, bread page 137, bred page 26, burrow page 86, bay, bey page 55, bee page 29, beach page 39, boll page 32, bowl page 40, bole page 22, bolt page 23, but page 21, brake page 42, break page 40, cane page 22, call page 32, cannon, canon page 56, cession, session page 108, canvass page 104, seal page 40, course, coarse page 39, cost page 45, core page 22, corps page 154, sell page 32, century page 43, choler page 123, collar page 34, chord page 123, cite, site page 22, sight page 118, chronicle page 123, complement page 91, compliment page 62, and again on page 91! cousin, cozen page 139, current page 105, deer page 29, dear page 45, cask page 31, cellar page 25, and again on page 57! seed page 29, sent, scent page 23, and again in this lesson on page 149!! cellar page 34, clime page 43, symbol page 73, and again on page 50! color page 61, dam page 20, dew page 45, fane page 23, fain page 40, feign page 155, dun page 21, dram page 26, elision, elysian page 123, ere page 22, ear, yew, fair, feat page 45, fare page 141, freeze, feet page 29, flea page 39, flee page 29, flour, foul, fowl page 38, forth, fourth page 84, gilt page 23, guilt, great, grown page 45, grate page 47, groan, hail page 40, hale page 22, hart page 21, hare page 141, hair, hear, hew page 45, here page 22, him page 21, heel page 29, heal page 40, haul page 17, hall page 32, isle page 154, inn, kill page 32, knap, knave, knead, kneel, know, knight, knot page 136, need page 29, neal page 40, new page 45, night page 118, not page 21, lade page 22, laid, leak page 39, lain page 40, lane page 22, and again on page 45! leek page 29, lesson, lessen page 39, led page 20, lye page 39, low page 45, lack page 31, lee page 29 leaf, lief page 39, loan page 40, lore page 22, lower page 145, loch page 31, lech page 123, main page 40, mane, made, male page 22, maid page 39, mail p. 40, manor, p. 43, meet p. 29, meat p. 45, mien, mean p. 40, mule p. 22, minor p. 57, moan page 40, moat page 45, more, mite page 22, mettle page 142, naught page 47, nay page 55, net page 21, ought page 156, oar page 45, ore page 22, won page 30, our, hour page 38, plum page 26, pale page 22, pail, pain page 40, pane page 22, palate page 50, pallet page 65, pole page 22, poll page 32, peel page 29, peal page 40, pair page 45, pare page 141, plain page 40, pray, prey page 55, prophet page 68, profit page 34, pence page 39, pannel page 44, raze page 22, rain page 40, reign page 155, rap page 54, read page 38, and again on page 145! reed page 29, red page 20, reek page 29, rest page 21, rice page 22, ring, wring page 134, rite page 22, right page 118, road page 39, rear page 45, rigger page 121, rigor page 61, roo page 38, rough page 155, ruff page 32, row, roar page 45, rabbet page 61, sail page 40, sale page 22, sea page 39, see page 29, savor page 27, seen page 29, senior page 121, seignior page 155, shear page 45, sheer page 29, sow page 45, sum, sun page 21, some page 55, son page 30, stare page 111, stair page 45, steel page 29, succor page 61, slight page 118, sole page 22, soul page 40, slay page 55, slow page 45, stake page 12, steak page 40, stile page 43, tax page 21, throw, throe page 84, tear *twice* on page 45! tare page 141, tier page 45, team page 40, teem page 29, tide page 22, their, there, the, thee page 118, two page 30, vail page 10, vice page 22, wait, weight, waist page 45, wear page 45, and again on page 141! ware page 141, waste page 118, way page 55, week page 29, weak page 10, wood page 30, would page 151, wether page 115, been, beau, one, done, dough, neigh, sleigh, weigh, bough page 154—TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-THREE WORDS—all of which are *intermingled* in the lessons with other words where their *distinctive* definitions are *not* given, and are again inserted on these pages, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, and 150!

Thirdly:—There are in the preceding spelling lessons, where their distinctive definitions are *not* given, *fifty-six* words, two of which are pronounced alike, but which Mr. Ely has *not* classed in this lesson, neither can the scholar learn their distinctive definitions in any of the spelling lessons of the book; as ate page 22, and eight page 45; bare and bear page 141; day and dey page 55, flew page 45, and flue page 39; fore page 22, and four page 45; gage page 22, and gauge page 154; gait page 45, and gate page 22; hole page 22, and whole page 119; maiz page 39, and maze page 22; mare page 141, and mayor page 74; mead page 39, and meed page 29; peer page 29, and pier page 45; plait page 45, and plate page 47; soar page 45, and sore page 22; sine page 22, and sign page 138; tale page 22, and tail page 40; tole p. 22, toll page 32; tray and trey page 55; wane page 22, and wain page 45; ween page 29, and wean page 40; wall page 32, and waul page 47; dust page 24 and 145, and dost page 145; [These two words are classed on page 145, as being "*not* exactly alike in pronunciation," but in Mr. Webster's octavo dictionary they *are* pronounced alike! dost is *not* in Webster's duodecimo dictionary!] nit page 21 and knit page 136; bruit page 45, and brute page 118; anker page 56, and anchor page 123; travel page 57, and travail page 73; cruel page 25, and crewel page 87; asperate and aspirate page 103—FIFTY-SIX—are *not* classed with their distinctive definitions!

Fourthly:—Mr. Ely has also inserted in the other lessons *seventy three* words each of which has another word corresponding in sound in Mr. Webster's dictionary, not one of which is in this lesson, or in any other spelling lesson of the book, consequently the scholar can not, from the use of the *Elementary* Spelling-Book, ever become acquainted with the orthography or distinctive definitions of the sixty-eight words corresponding in sound with these! as halt page 45, baize page 39, bloat page 45, seer page 29 and sear page 45, glare page 141, hoard page 39, hay and key page 56, (quay is pronounced as key in Webster's octavo dictionary.) peak page 39, place page 42, port page 55, float page 45, queen page 29, rhyme page 155, slew page 45, (*not* in Webster's duodecimo, but in his octavo dictionary,) swear page 45 and 141, throne page 84, gore page 22, thyme page 37, beaux page 154, wade page 22, wail page 40, wheel page 119, chaste page 118, choir page 37 and 123, [choir is pronounced as quire both in Webster's octavo and school dictionaries, but Mr. Ely has inserted it in the Spelling-Book on pages 37 and 123, and in *both* cases has given of the diphthongal sound, *contrary* to *both* the dictionaries!!!] phrase page 57, gloze page 47, nose page 57, lees page 29, [lease, to glean, is pronounced as lees in Webster's octavo, but *not* in his school dictionary!] greaves page 45, told page 27, muse page 37, praise page 39, prize, fawn page 47, clause page 47, haw page 55, pause page 47, sense page 145, chough page 155, gild page 124, jest page 24, guest page 45, jam, nag page 20, retch page 33, rung page 134, tense page 36, shock page 31, whoop page 119, threw page 84, grater page 57, holy page 25, prior, razor page 57, treatise page 87, castor page 44, fungus page 134, galley page 34, girder page 125, latin page 64, levy page 61, pencil page 44, avail page 78, discreet page 28, consent page 71, calendar page 94, cetaceous page 127, concession, intention page 97, seize p. 39, allegation p. 98—SEVENTY-THREE WORDS—the words corresponding in sound with which are *not* in any spelling lesson of the book!

Fifthly:—There are likewise a great many words of this class in Mr. Webster's dictionary, that is, two or more which are sounded alike but spelled differently, not one of which has Mr. Ely inserted in this lesson, neither are they in any other spelling lesson of the Elementary Spelling-Book, consequently the scholar will never be taught their sound, orthography, or distinctive definitions from this book, neither will he even learn that there are such words in the language! as deuce and duse, feaze and fees, faint and feint, ho and hoe, hoes and hose, size, sice, and sighs, sire and sigher, straight and strait, tire and tier, waive and wave, bald and bawled, cinque and sink, limb and limn, links and lynx, bruise and brews, cruise and crews, baiting and bating, weakly and weekly, mareschal, marshal, and martial, better and bettor, callous and callus, cingle and single, cygnet and signet, discous and discus, subtle and suttle, arrear and arriere, chagrin and shagreen, asperation and aspiration, &c. &c. none of which are in any of the spelling lessons of the Elementary Spelling-Book!!

Sixthly:—As Mr. Ely has not given the pronunciation of the words in this lesson, we can not ascertain how he intended a number of these classes should be pronounced! as bell and belle, by and buy, sealing and ceiling, cion and sion, council and counsel, die and dye, dire and dyer, hie and high, hire and higher, indict and indite, liar, lier, and lyre, oh and owe, pleas and please, rye and wry, rote and wrote, tow and toe, vial and viol, &c.: although Mr. Ely has said at the head of this lesson "Words pronounced alike," yet he has not given the pronunciation of *either* of the words of the preceding classes, in this or any other spelling lesson of the book!

Seventhly:—There is a number of classes in this lesson, in which Mr. Ely has classed only *two* or *three* words of similar sound, when there are *three* or *four* in the other spelling lessons, and in Webster's dictionary; as by buy, pare pair, rain reign, shear sheer, slay sley sleigh, too two, vane vein, but has *omitted* to class with them bye, bear p. 141, rein, shire, slaie, to, vain p. 45!

Eighthly:—Mr. Ely has classed a number of words in this lesson, as being sounded alike, which evidently are not, and should *not* be alike; as centaury and century, chronical and chronicle, currant and current, symbol and cymbal, principal and principle, &c. [On page 145 Mr. Ely has classed the words medal and meddle with "words *nearly*, but *not exactly alike in pronunciation*," yet in this lesson he has classed the preceding words chronical and *chronicle*, *principal and principle*, having the *same* termination, (medal and meddle), as being pronounced alike!

Ninthly:—*Mr. Ely has also* spelled a number of these words *contrary* to Webster's dictionary; thus, bass

music) does *not* appear at all in Webster's school dictionary, and this class (base, low, vile, and bass in music) do *not* belong in this lesson! boult, (to sift) does *not* appear in Webster's school dictionary, and this class (bolt, a fastening to a door, and boult, to sift) does *not* belong in this lesson! casque, (a helmet) does not appear in Webster's school dictionary, and this class (cask, a vessel for liquids, and casque, a helmet,) does not belong in this lesson! drachm, (a small weight) does *not* appear in Webster's school dictionary, and this class (dram, a drink of spirit, and drachm, a small weight) does *not* belong in this lesson! nought (none) is *not* the preferable spelling in Webster's school dictionary, and this class (naught, bad, and nought, none) does *not* belong in this lesson! nett (clear of charges) does *not* appear in Webster's school dictionary, and this class (net, a woven snare, and nett, clear of charges) does *not* belong in this lesson! ouse (tanners' bark) does *not* appear in Webster's school dictionary, and this class (ooze, to issue out, and ouse, tanners' bark) does *not* belong in this lesson! route, (a way or course) is *not* the preferable spelling in Webster's school dictionary, and this class (rout, a confused quarrel, and route, a course or way) does *not* belong in this lesson! seine, (a fish net) is spelled *contrary* to Webster's dictionary; should be sean! [In Mr. Webster's quarto and octavo dictionaries he says under the word net: "it is sometimes written *nett*, but improperly," yet Mr. Ely has inserted *nett* in this lesson!!] Thus Mr. Ely has inserted in this lesson EIGHT classes of "words pronounced alike, but *different* in orthography," while they are in Webster's dictionary with but *one* orthography!

Tenthly: Mr. Ely has, in this lesson, on p. 146 second column, inserted cent, sent and scent, with their distinctive definitions; and, he has inserted sent and scent *again* on p. 149, first column!! On p. 147, *dun* and *nap* are inserted *twice!* On p. 119, he has "*rear*, to raise," and "*rear*, the hind part," with rear spelled *alike* in *both* cases; yet Mr. Ely has classed it here with "*words pronounced alike, but DIFFERENT in orthography*"!!! Same page 119, Mr. Ely has inserted "*shore*, sea coast," and "*shore*, a prop," with shore spelled *alike* in both cases; yet he has classed it here with "words, *different* in orthography"!! [In Mr. Webster's *old* Spelling Book, he had, on p. 118, "shore, side of a river," and, "shoar, a prop," a *blunder* which he evidently *copied* from Dilworth's Spelling Book. This *blunder* Mr. Ely corrected, either by the assistance of Walker's Rhyming Dictionary, London Edition 1821, (See Introduction to this review p. 6,) or from the criticism which appeared in the Albany Argus (see p. 32,) yet he has *retained* the word in this lesson with words *different* in orthography!!!] The definitions of some of these classes are rather *singular*, as "*nap*, on cloth;" "*fane*, a weather-cock," &c. &c.! [See 'Webster's school dictionary, in which they are *not* thus defined.] On pages 150, 151, 152, 153, Mr. Ely has given short sentences, in which the words of distinctive definitions are exhibited, as, "What *ails* the child?" &c. &c. In these sentences Mr. Ely has inserted *better* and *bettor*, *calendar* and *calender*, *meal*, *flew* and *flue*, *peak* and *pique*, *peer* and *pier*, *pare* and *pour*, *rein* *sign*, *threw* and *through*, *strait* and *straight*, *tail* and *tale*, &c. when he has not classed one of them with the words of distinctive definitions! On p. 154 and 155, Mr. Ely has given a class of "*words of irregular orthography*." This lesson contains a great many words which were in the lesson containing words of distinctive definitions, and, therefore, as the pronunciation of those words is *not* given, this lesson (p. 154) should have *preceded* the words of distinctive definitions, or their pronunciation be given to avoid the repetition of them here; as p. 154, beau, been, isle, one, done, would, dough, neigh, sleigh, weigh, bough, p. 155, seignior, &c.!

On p. 155, he has a class of words in which "*h* after *r* is silent," and on p. 129 he has *rh*etoric, and on p. 128 *rh*inoceros, with *h* italick; and they are inserted *again* in this lesson!

On p. 156, Mr. Ely has a class of words of which he says, "in the following, *ue* at the end of the primitive word are silent," and he has inserted *roguish* in this lesson, in which there is no *ue!* again, he has *roguery*, in which the *ue* are not silent in Webster's octavo, but are in his school dictionary! And again, he has *mosque* and *opaque* in this lesson, wrongly spelled and classed, as they are both spelled without *ue* in Webster's school dictionary, thus, *mosk* and *opake!!*

A great evil attending this system of classification by terminations, is, that the scholars will, in many instances, obtain the habit of a monotonous sing song pronunciation; and, the system also leads, in a great many instances, to error in the pronunciation of the terminating syllable; thus, on p. 104, fourth column, chilblain, villain, mortmain, plantain, vervain, curtain, in which the sound of *ai* should be changed *three* times in sounding the six words, from long *a* to short *i*, and from long *i* to short *a!* The scholar will, as they are now classed, naturally pronounce them *all* with *a* long, or *all* with *i* short! Same page second column, annals and entrails, and no rule is given for their pronunciation. The scholar will, most unquestionably, be inclined to pronounce both terminations with *a* short, or *a* long. The same may be said of the next two words *mittens* and *summons*, in which terminations they will pronounce the *e* and *o* alike, &c. &c. examples of which may be seen on almost every page of the book, where there are spelling lessons.

ARRANGEMENT.

Next in importance to the proper *classification* of words intended for spelling lessons, containing the different and peculiar vowel and consonant sounds, is the due *arrangement* of the words thus classed, according to the case or difficulty with which their orthography and pronunciation are learned.

Thus, on page 29, Mr. Ely has inserted monosyllables containing *ee*, on p. 30, those containing *oo*, and on p. 32 words which contain *dd*, *bb*, *gg*, *ll*, *ss*, *rr*, as lees, breeze, goose, odd, ebb, egg, pass, purr, &c. and page 36 in which *dge*, *tch*, *lph*, *mph*, &c. as midge, scratch, sylph, nymph, &c. But, on p. 42, he has words with *a*, *i*, and *o* long, as blade, slide, choke, p. 43, spoke, blame, p. 47, tine, drone, brave, drove, which are much more easy for the scholar to learn than those on pages 29, 30, 32, and p. 36, *preceding* them as noted above! Again, Mr. Ely has a class of monosyllables on p. 117 which are more easily learned than those on pp. 32, or 36! Again, Mr. Ely has on pages 51 and 52, inserted words of *four* syllables, and on p. 61, he has easy words of *two* syllables! He has a class of words of *three* syllables on pages 82 and 84, and words of *two* syllables much more easily learned on pages 86 and 87! On page 84, he has difficult monosyllables in which the sound of *th* is exhibited, and on p. 117, *thirty* pages *after* them, he has *easy* monosyllables! On pages 121 and 125, he has words in which *g* is hard before *e*, *i*, and *y*, which is one of the most *easy* lessons in the spelling-book, placed *after* the words in which *x* has the sound of *gz*, p. 120, *t* the sound of *tsh*, p. 121, *i* the sound of *y*, p. 122, *s* and *z*, the sound of *zh*, p. 122 and 123, *ch* like *k*, p. 123, which are the most *difficult* lessons in the spelling book! On p. 131, he has words in which *ng* has its open and close sound, which is one of the most *easy* lessons in the book, placed *after* the words in which *c*, *s*, and *t*, have the sound of *sh*, on pp. 126, 127, and 128, which are the most difficult in the language! And again, the words which end in *le* on pages 141, 142, 143, and 144, are placed *after* ten or fifteen lessons, the orthography of which is more *difficult* to be obtained, than that of the lessons *preceding*, as above noted. Thus, I think it will appear evident to every person, on examination, that those lessons are *not* all *arranged* with due regard to the case of learning their orthography or pronunciation.

ORTHOGRAPHY.

There is, perhaps, no branch of education by which the learned and the illiterate are so readily and so generally distinguished, as that of spelling. So universal is the condemnation of bad spelling, among all classes of citizens, whether professional, mercantile, or mechanical, that no person, it is believed, can be found who would be willing to be identified with it. The subject of orthography, therefore, is of primary importance in the education of children, and should engage the attention of parents, and all *teachers more especially*, since it may fairly be assumed that *one third* of the whole time spent in acquiring a useful education, is devoted to this particular branch.

I will now show, that, although Mr. Ely has, in the orthography of the *Elementary* Spelling-Book, avoided most of the errours in spelling pointed out in the Albany Argus in 1827, [see page 32,] yet he has spelled *other* words contrary to ALL of Webster's dictionaries; so that the orthography of the *new* spelling-book is MORE ERRONEOUS than that of the *old* one!

First:—Mr. Ely has spelled a great many words *contrary* to *all* of *Webster's* dictionaries, but *agreeably* to Johnson and Walker!

Secondly:—Mr. Ely has spelled a number of words *contrary* to the orthography of *Webster's* duodecimo school dictionary, "*his last work, all written and corrected by himself*," but *agreeably* to either *Webster's* octavo or quarto dictionary!

Thirdly:—Mr. Ely has spelled a number of words *contrary* to ALL of Webster's *dictionaries*, but agreeably to Webster's *old* spelling-book!

Fourthly:—Mr. Ely has spelled a number of words *contrary* to ALL Webster's *dictionaries*, *contrary* to his *old spelling-book, and also contrary to the orthography of Johnson and Walker!!*

Fifthly:—Mr. Ely has also spelled the same words in *two* DIFFERENT ways, while it is spelled but one way in *all of Webster's dictionaries!!*

Sixthly :—Mr. Ely has frequently spelled a word but *one* way, while it is spelled *two* ways in Webster's dictionaries; and, he has sometimes given the orthography which Mr. Webster *has* preferred, by placing it first in his dictionaries, and at other times he has given that which Mr. Webster has *not* preferred !

Thus, on page 8, Mr. Ely has *brasier*, *agreeably* to Webster's dictionaries, and on page 122 he has it *brazier*, *contrary* to *all* of them ! On page 13, *trissyllable* with *ss*, *contrary* to all Webster's dictionaries ! On page 20, he has spelled *rud* (rudd,) contrary to Webster's dictionary ! On page 21, he has spelled *dum* (dumb,) contrary to Webster's dictionary ! Same page *ren*, and it is *wren* in Webster's dictionary ! Same page *bun*, and it is spelled *bun* and *bunn* in Webster's school dictionary ! Same page 21, *woot agreeably* to Webster's dictionary, and it is spelled *wot* on the same page, *contrary* to Webster ! On page 22 *fuge*, and it is spelled *fugue* in Webster's dictionary ! Same page 22, *cale*, spelled *kale* in Webster's dictionary ! On page 23, *brent*, and it is spelled *brant* in Webster's school dictionary ! On page 24, *chapt*, *blest*, *drest*, *curst*, and they are spelled *chapped*, *blessed*, *dressed*, and *cursed* in Webster's school dictionary ! ! Same page 24, *cist*, and it is spelled *cyst* on page 8, and in *all* Webster's dictionaries ! ! On page 26, *swop*, and it is spelled *swap* on page 47, and in Webster's school dictionary ! Same page 26, *sted*, and it is spelled *stead* on page 137, and it is spelled in these two ways in Webster's dictionaries ! but *stead* is placed *first* in the dictionary, and Mr. Ely has *sted* first in the spelling-book, so that the scholar who learns *sted* on page 26, will pass *one hundred and ten* pages before he will know Webster's *preferable* spelling *stead* ! ! On page 27, *cranch*, contrary to Webster's quarto and octavo dictionaries, but it is spelled *craunch* and *cranch* in the school dictionary, but *craunch* is placed first as the *preferable* spelling in that dictionary ; Mr. Ely has therefore, spelled it *contrary* to all of them ! On same page 27, *hanch*, contrary to Webster's quarto and octavo, but in the school dictionary he has it *hanch*, *haunch* in one place, and *haunch* and *hanch* in another ; thus, alternately giving each spelling a preference by placing it first ! ! ! On page 29, Mr. Ely has spelled *sneek*, *contrary* to Webster's dictionary, but on page 39, he has spelled it *sneak*, *agreeably* to Webster ! On page 30, *ton*, *contrary* to Webster's dictionary, and on page 150, he has spelled it *tun*, agreeably to Webster ! On page 31, *slick*, contrary to Webster's school dictionary, in which it is spelled *sleek* ! [*Slick* is the *vulgar* pronunciation of *sleek* !] On page 32, *scall*, contrary to Webster's school dictionary, in which it is spelled *scald* ! On same page 32, *burr* and *bur* two ways, and but *one* way (bur) in Webster's dictionary ! On same page 32, *trass*. The word is *not* in Webster's school dictionary, but in the quarto and octavo it is spelled *tarrace*, *tarrass*, *terrass*, and *trass*, and Mr. Ely has taken the orthography least preferred by Mr. Webster, or the shortest spelling ! ! On page 35, *cumfrey* and *comfry* in Webster's school dictionary ; but it is spelled *three* ways in Webster's quarto and octavo dictionaries, thus, *comfrey*, *comfry*, and *cumfrey* ! ! On page 37, *phleme*, and *fleam* in Webster's dictionary ! Same page 37, *coif* and *quoif*, but *coif* is the *preferable* word in Webster's dictionary ! On page 40, *mein*, and on page 148, it is spelled *mien* ! On page 41, he has *villainy* with *i* in the second syllable, *contrary* to the *preferable* spelling in Webster's quarto, but *agreeably* to Webster's school dictionary ! On page 42, *splice*, contrary to Webster's school dictionary ; but it is spelled *splice* and *splise* both ways in Webster's quarto and octavo dictionaries ! On page 43, *peddler* agreeably to Webster's school dictionary, but contrary to the quarto and octavo ! On page 45, *chints*, contrary to Webster's school dictionary, but agreeably to his quarto and octavo ! Same page 45, *shew* and *show* two ways, but *one* way (show) in Webster's school dictionary ! On page 47, *haunt*, *flaunt*, and *vaunt* but *one* way, and they are all spelled *two* ways in Webster's school dictionary ! On page 49, *enthrallment*, and *inthrallment* in all Webster's dictionaries ! On page 50, *hillock*, *hemlock*, and *mattock* with *k*, *contrary* to Webster's octavo, but agreeably to his quarto and school dictionaries ! On page 55, *plow* ; spelled two ways in Webster's octavo dictionary ! On p. 56, *ledger*, and leger is the *preferable* spelling in Webster's school dictionary ! Same page 56, *satchel* contrary to all Webster's dictionaries, but agreeably to his *old* spelling-book ! On page 59, *panado*, but *panada* is the preferable spelling in Webster's school dictionary ! On same page 59, *potatoe*, *contrary* to Webster's quarto, but *agreeably* to his school dictionary ! Same page *maneuver* and *melasses*, and *manoeuvre* and *molasses* is the *preferable* spelling in the octavo ! On p. 61, *debonair*, *contrary* to all three of Webster's dictionaries (debonnair,) but *agreeably* to his *old* spelling-book ! On same p. 61, *sentry*, and in Webster's school dictionary, he says, "*sentry, a corruption of the word sentinel !*" Same p. *wintry*, and wintery, in Webster's dictionary ! p. 62, *lilly*, and *lily* Webster's dictionary ! p. 62, *holiday*, spelled *holyday* in the dictionary ! p. 64, *ribin* and *porpess*, and *ribbon* and *porpoise* is the *preferable* spelling in Webster's octavo dictionary ! Same p. *gordon*, *two* syllables and it is spelled *gordian*, *three* syllables, in Webster's dictionaries ! ! Same p. *griffin*, spelled *griffon* in Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 65, *gimblet*, spelled *two* ways in Webster's octavo dictionary, thus, *gimblet*, *gimlet* ! On p. 68, *scurrilous* with *rr*, but with single *r* in Webster's school dictionary ! On p. 70, *almanack* with *k*, but it is spelled without *k* in Webster's octavo dictionary ! Same p. *laureat*, and *laureate* in Webster's dictionaries ! Same p. 70, *pompion* and *pumkin*, and it is spelled *pumpkin* in Webster's school dictionary ! On p. 73, *handsel* and on p. 157 *hansel* ; and it is spelled *handsel* only in Webster's dictionaries ! *hansel* is agreeable to Webster's *old* spelling-book ! Same p. 73, *sylvan*, spelled *silvan* in Webster's school dictionary ! On p. 75, *unmixt*, and *unmixed* is the *preferable* spelling in Webster's school dictionary ! On p. 76, *millennial* with *nn*, spelled with single *n* in all three of Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 78, *opake*, agreeably to Webster's quarto and school dictionaries, but on p. 156, it is spelled *opaque* agreeably to Walker and to the *preferable* spelling in Webster's octavo ! On p. 79, *insnare agreeably* to Webster's dictionaries, but on p. 141, it is spelled *ensnare* contrary to them ! Same p. 79, *raccoon*, spelled contrary to Webster's quarto and octavo dictionaries, but *agreeably* to his school dictionary ! Same p. 79, *paltroon*, and it is spelled *poltroon* in all three of Webster's dictionaries !

On p. 81, *bastinado*, *four* syllables, spelled *bastinade*, *three* syllables, in Webster's school dictionary ! On p. 82, *cullender*, and it is spelled *colander* in all three of Webster's dictionaries ; thus, there are *three blunders* in this word, *o* first syllable, one *l*, and *a* in the second syllable in Webster's dictionaries, and *u* first syllable, *ll* and *e* in the second syllable in the spelling-book ! ! ! On p. 83, *villainous* ; *villanous* is the *preferable* spelling in the octavo and quarto ! Same p. 83, *withall*, *ll*, and it is spelled *withal* single *l* in Webster's quarto and octavo, but with *ll* in his school dictionary ! On p. 84, *thowl*, spelled *thole* in all Webster's dictionaries ! Same p. *meath*, spelled *meathe* in Webster's octavo and quarto, but is *not* in his school dictionary ! ! Same p. 84, *highth*, and on p. 118, *hight* ; it is spelled *hight* and *highth* in Webster's school dictionary ; in his quarto, *height*, *highth*, and *hight* ; but in the octavo *height*, *hight*, and *highth* ! ! ! Same p. *thresh* and *thrash* spelled *two* ways and but *one* way in Webster's dictionary ! Same p. 84, *thumb*, and *thum* without *b* is the *preferable* spelling in Webster's quarto dictionary ! Same p. *sheathe* (verb) with final *e*, but without *e* is the preferable spelling in Webster's school dictionary ! On p. 85, *thresh*, and *thrash* in Webster's dictionary ! Same p. *thresher*, spelled *thrasher* in Webster's dictionary ! Same p. 85, *gipsy*, spelled *gipsey* in Webster's quarto, but *gipsy* in his school dictionary ! On p. 86, *furlow*, and *furlough* is the preferable spelling in Webster's octavo dictionary ! On p. 87, *hainous* and *nightmar*, and *heinous* and *nightmare* is the *preferable* spelling in the octavo dictionary ! Same p. 87 *trefoil*, single *e*, spelled with *ee* in Webster's school dictionary, but with single *e* in his quarto and octavo ! On p. 88, *turquois*, not in Webster's school dictionary, but it is spelled *turkois* in his octavo ! On p. 89 *mellifluous* and *mellifluent*, spelled with *ff*, but they are both spelled with single *f* in all three of Webster's dictionaries ! Same p. 89, *accouterment*, spelled *accoutrement* in Webster's octavo dictionary ! On p. 91, *consistency*, *four* syllables, spelled *consistence*, *three* syllables, in Webster's school dictionary ! On p. 93, *instrumentality* single *l*, *instrumentallity ll*, in Webster's school dictionary ! Same p. 93, *generallissimo*, with *ll*, and with single *l* in all Webster's dictionaries ! Same p. *antedeluvian*, *e third* syllable, but *i* in Webster's dictionary ! On p. 94, *cimiter*, spelled *cimeter* in Webster's school dictionary, but not in his quarto and octavo ! Same p. *basalisk*, spelled *basilisk* in all Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 96, *inadvertency*, *five* syllables, *inadvertence*, *four* syllables, in Webster's school dictionary ! On p. 99, *apposite*, spelled *apposit* in Webster's school dictionary, but *apposite* in his quarto and octavo ! Same p. 99, *barbacue*, spelled *barbecue* in all Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 103, *ventillate*, with *ll*, spelled with single *l*, in all Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 106, *alcoran*, spelled *alkoran* and *koran* in all Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 107, *midling*, single *d*, spelled with *dd* in all Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 108, *headache* and *heartache*, spelled without final *e* in Webster's quarto dictionary, but with *e* in the octavo ; and they are spelled with final *ache* and *ake* in the school dictionary ! ! On p. 110, *millennium*, with *nn*, agreeably to Walker, and it is spelled with single *n* in all Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 111, *innoculate*, with *nn*, spelled with single *n* in all Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 112, *appelative*, single *l*, spelled with *ll* in all Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 113, *valetudenarian* and *valetudinarian* two *different* ways on the *same* page ; Same p. *asbestos*, *asbestus* in dictionary ! On p. 114, *threatning*, *two* syllables, spelled *threatening*, *three* syllables, in all Webster's dictionaries ! Same p. *enthrall*, spelled *inthrall* in all Webster's dictionaries ! Same p. apothegm, spelled apothem, in Webster's school dictionary as the *preferable* spelling, and it is spelled *three* ways in his quarto and octavo ! [See page 47.] On pp. 115 and 138, *burthen* with *th*, and *burden* with *d* on p. 138, and p. 168, spelled burden only with d, in all Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 84, *encumber*, spelled *two ways* in Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 115, *tether*, spelled tedder in Webster's dictionaries ! On p. 119, whiggism with one *g*, and *whiggism* with *gg* in all Webster's dictionaries ! Same p. whoopingcough with w, and it is spelled without w in Webster's dictionaries, and in the dictionaries of Johnson and Walker ! ! On p. 122, postilion, single l, spelled postillion, with ll, Webster's dictionaries ! Same p. brazier with *z*, and with *s* in Webster's dictionary ! On p. 123, abscision, spelled abscission in Webster's dictionaries ! Same blunder in the *old* spelling-book. [See page 32.] Same p. 123, rescision ; it is spelled two ways

Webster's dictionaries, thus *revision* and *reevision*, and Mr. Ely has spelled it *contrary* to both of them! Same p. 123, *mastick*, spelled two ways in Webster's quarto and octavo! Same p. *cholic*, spelled without *h* in all Webster's dictionaries, and in the dictionaries of Johnson and Walker. [The same blunder is in Webster's *old* spelling-book, evidently *copied* from Dilworth's spelling-book.] See p. 22.] Same p. 123, *chamelion*, spelled *chameleon* in Webster's quarto and octavo dictionaries! On p. 124, *haggish*, with *gg* agreeably to his *old* spelling book, and to Johnson and Walker, *contrary* to all his dictionaries!! On p. 125, *twiggin*, contrary to his dictionaries, agreeably to his *old* spelling-book! On p. 128, *flagitious*, spelled contrary to all Webster's dictionaries and to his *old* spelling-book! [See p. 30.] Same p. 128, *novitiate*, spelled *contrary* to all Webster's dictionaries, but agreeably to his *old* spelling-book! [See p. 58.] On p. 123, *chimist*, *chimistry*, *chimical*, and *alchimy*, on p. 129, *alchimic*, with *i*, spelled with *e* in Webster's octavo dictionary 1828! [See pages 23, 47, and 48.] On p. 129, *ecstatic*, and on p. 131, *extatic* spelled *differently*! On p. 131, *paragoric*, spelled *paregoric* in all Webster's dictionaries! On p. 133, *exorcize* with *z*, but it is spelled *exorcise* with *s* in all Webster's dictionaries, and in the dictionaries of Johnson and Walker! On p. 137, *bucaneer*, spelled two ways in Webster's quarto and octavo dictionaries! [See p. 48.] Same p. *cannonier*, spelled *cannoneer* as the *preferable* spelling in Webster's quarto and octavo! Same p. *carbinier*, spelled *carabineer* as the preferable spelling in Webster's octavo and quarto dictionary! Same p. *farine*, spelled *farina* in all Webster's dictionaries! Same p. *dreamt*, spelled *dreamed* as the preferable spelling in Webster's school dictionary! On p. 138, *repugnancy*, *four* syllables, spelled *repugnance*, *three* syllables in Webster's school dictionary! Same p. *blazen*, spelled *blazon* in all Webster's dictionaries! On p. 141, *hazle* with *le*, spelled *hazel* with *el* in all Webster's dictionaries! Same p. *bauble*, spelled *bauble* in all Webster's dictionaries! On p. 142, *coddle* with *dd*, spelled *codle* with single *d*, as the preferable spelling in all Webster's dictionaries! On p. 143, *raddish*, spelled *radish* with single *d* in Webster's dictionaries! The *erroneous* orthography of the eight words contained in the class of words of distinctive definitions was pointed out on p. 44. On p. 150, *briar*, and on p. 25, *briar*, two ways, agreeably to his *old* spelling-book, contrary to all his dictionaries! On p. 151, *oose*, and on p. 148, *ooze* and *ouse*, three ways, and it is spelled but *one way ooze* in Webster's school dictionary! On p. 152 *route*, *seine*, spelled *sein* and *rout* in Webster's dictionaries! Same p. *seignor*, spelled *seignor* on p. 149, and 155, and in Webster's dictionaries! [*seignor* is a *blunder* in his *old* spelling-book, evidently *copied* from Dilworth. See pp. 32 and 51.] On p. 153, *basseviol*, and on p. 39, *baseviol*, spelled *bassviol* in Webster's school dictionary! On p. 154, *croup* spelled two ways in Webster's school dictionary! Same p. *masque*, and *mask* in all Webster's dictionaries! On p. 155, *brunette*, and *brunet* preferable spelling in Webster's school dictionary! Same p. *bdellium*, and *bdelium* in Webster's school dictionary! On p. 156, *mosque* spelled agreeably to his *old* spelling-book, contrary to all his dictionaries, but agreeably to Johnson and Walker! *Opaque* on the same p.; the erroneous orthography of which has been pointed out! Same p. *nought* and *tongue*, spelled *naught* and *tung*, as the preferable spelling in his school dictionary! On p. 153, *dishevel*, spelled *dishevel* in Webster's school dictionary! On p. 160, *wo* and *woe* spelled two ways, and but one (woe) in Webster's school dictionary! Thus I have pointed out some of the most prominent differences in the orthography of the Elementary spelling-book, and Webster's dictionaries, and have fully shown, it is believed, that the orthography of the new spelling-book is MORE ERRONEOUS than the *old* one!

PRONUNCIATION.

I shall now take notice of the "ANALYSIS OF SOUNDS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE," and point out what I consider defective in it. And first:—It is stated on page 9, that "the short sound of *o* in *not*, is somewhat lengthened before *r*, *s*, and *ng*, as in *nor*, *cross*, *broth*, *belong*;" yet Mr. Ely has made no distinction between the long broad *o*, and short broad *o*, in the classification of the words in the spelling-book! Thus, on page 31, he has *orbit* and *vomit*, *mortar* and *robber*, &c. &c. all classed under figure two, sounded alike! But Mr. Webster did make a distinction between these two sounds of *o*, as it should be, in his *old* spelling-book! In the Analysis of the sounds of the consonants, Mr. Ely has told us that some of the consonants are *silent*, yet there are other consonants which are silent, respecting the silence of which he has said nothing. Again, he has told us that some of the consonants are never silent, yet there are others which are never silent also, of which he has said nothing. This I presume will be considered a very great *defect*; for the scholar would suppose (and reasonably) that as he has spoken of the silence of some of the consonants, he had noted *all* which are *silent* in his spelling lessons: yet this is not the case.

The same *defects* which exist in noting the sounds of the letters B, C, D, F, G, H, J, K, L, M, N, P, Q, S, T, V, X, and Z, pointed out on pages 33 and 34, as contained in his *old* spelling-book, are so very similar, and equally numerous, that it seems to be unnecessary to repeat them here, and the reader is, therefore, referred to those pages for their explanation. It is true Mr. Ely has told us on page 11, that "P before *s* is mute;" but he has not told us that it is silent before *t*, in the same syllable, or between *m* and *t* in the same syllable. He has told us that *h* is silent after *r*, but he has not told us that it is ever silent in any other situation, as in *herb*, *honor*, &c.! Although Mr. Ely has some letters in italick in his spelling lessons, yet he has not told us in his "ANALYSIS," that *silent* letters *are* printed in italick! and, consequently, inasmuch as he has *not* all *silent* letters in italick in all his spelling lessons, the pronunciation must be more defective, indeterminate, and uncertain, than in the spelling lessons of the *old* spelling-book in which the silent letters *were* in italick! Thus, on page 80, in receipt, the *p* is italick, but in *temptation* page 95, *consumption* page 97, *consumptive* and *presumptive* page 66, *peremptory* page 67, &c. the *p* is not in italick, and we can *not* know from the spelling-book, whether the *p* should be sounded or not! Again, *h* is italick in *hour* page 38, in *honor* page 61, but *not* in herb page 27! Shall we pronounce it *erb* or *herb*? On page 30, *two*, *w* is *not* in italick as it is on page 39 in the *old* spelling-book! Shall we sound the *w*? The answer to this question can not be known until we arrive at page 149, where *two* is classed with *too* in which there is no *w*! Is the first *t* silent in *chestnut* page 35, or should it be sounded? Is *h* silent in *thyme* page 37, or should it be sounded? The *u* is italick in guile page 43, but *not* in guileful page 87. Should it be sounded in guileful? On page 45, *eight*, *weight*, &c., page 80, *alight*, *delight*, &c., page 118, *fight*, &c., *gh* not in italick, but in italick in daughter and slaughter page 107! On page 47, Mr Ely has *salve*, *l* italick, and *calve*, in which *l* is also silent, he has among irregular words on page 134! Is the *a* silent in *mountainous* page 18? or in *mountaineer* page 61? Is *t* silent in *bankruptcy* page 82? On page 13, we are told that when "*e* follows a consonant, at the end of words, with a single vowel preceding, that vowel except the dotted *i*, is long as in fate, mete," &c. How then shall we sound the last *i* in *pristine* page 68, *i* in *famine*, *doctrine*, *destine*, &c. page 73, *promise* page 83, *executive* page 77, &c. &c.? Certainly *i* long. Shall we sound *a* long in *friday* page 74, or should the *a* be silent and the *y* sounded? &c &c. &c. Throughout all the spelling lessons, the same doubt and uncertainty exist relative to the pronunciation of the *silent* and other letters. Other omissions in his "ANALYSIS" might be shown, which greatly increase the defects in the classification, such as the compiler's omitting the *reasons* for the peculiar sounds of the letters in certain situations. This list might be extended almost without limitation, by a class of words, the pronunciation of which can *not* be determined, either by his "ANALYSIS" or his classification. On page 10 and on page 155, Mr. Ely has said, that *gh* in *hough* has the sound of *f*; but in all Webster's dictionaries it is sounded like *k*, thus, *hok*!! Again, on page 10, Mr. Ely has stated that "*gh* are mute in *every* English word, both in the middle and at the end of words, except in the following," *cough*, &c. How then shall we sound *draught*? On page 114, Mr. Ely has inserted *thistle* and *throstle*, in which *t* is silent in all Webster's dictionaries; Mr. Ely has inserted thistle, on page 113, in which he *has* noted the silence of *t*, but *throstle* is not thus noted. Is the first *h* silent or sounded in *diphthong* and *triphthong*, page 114? Shall we sound them *difthong* and *trifthong*, or *dipthong* and *tripthong*? Mr. Ely has not any where in the spelling-book informed us how to sound them! On page 10, Mr. Ely has stated that "*x* is sometimes pronounced as *gz*," but has *not* informed us in what situation *x* should have this sound! Is *p silent* in *exempt* and exemption page 120, or shall it be sounded? Is *t silent* in *christmas* and *christendom* page 123, or shall it be sounded in these words? The *p* and *t* are *not* sounded in the preceding, and all similar words in Webster's octavo dictionary! On page 11, Mr. Ely says "The digraph *ai*, in words of one syllable, and in accented syllables, has the sound of *a* long;" yet on page 141, he has a class of words over which he says. "In the following and similar words, (*bare*, *care*, *flare*, &c.) *a* before *r*, though marked with its first or long sound, *deviates a little from that sound, and accords* EXACTLY *with the sound* of *ai in* fair, pair," which, agreeably to his rule above noted (given on page 11.) *is a* long!!! And, again on page 79, Mr. Ely has classed *attain*, *despair*, *declare*, &c. *all* under figure 1, as having *precisely* the same sound!! On page 135, Mr. Ely has classed 29 words in which Walker and good speakers in this country and in England sound *t* as *tsh*. Over this lesson Mr. Ely has told us that this class of words *can* be and *are* sounded three different ways, yet he has *not* informed us *which* of the *three* ways to pronounce these words! It is quite singular that Mr. Webster has noted the aspiration of *s* like *zh* when followed by long *u* and preceded by the accent, as in measure, treasure, etc. but has not noted this aspiration of *t* like *tsh* in the same situation! and it is just as agreeable to analogy, to pronounce measure. pleasure, mez-ur, plez-ur, instead of mezh-ure, plezh-ure, as it is to pronounce nature, future, na-tur, fu-tur, instead of fu-tshure, na-tshure; for they (the *t* and *s*) are both preceded by the accent and followed by *u*, consequently both subject to aspiration from the same principle of analogy, as we sound *c*, *s*, and *t*, like *sh*, in gracious, pension, nation: for, although we sound *s* and *t* like *sh* in pension and nation, when followed by *i* and another vowel, yet when *s* is followed by *u* we sound it like *zh*, as in measure; and in like manner, should we (from the same analogy,) sound the *t* like *tsh*, when followed by long *u*, as in nature. On page 23, *ant*, *chant*, &c. *a* flat, and same page *plant*, *rant*, &c. *same* termination *a* short! On page 71, *transplant*, *a* flat in the first syllable, and *transact*, same page *a* short in first syllable! On page 75, *amass*, *repass*, *surpass*, *a* flat, and same page *cuirass*, and *morass*, *same* termination *a* short! On p. 63, *unloose* and *tattoo* are placed under figure 1, long *o*! On page 58, *slander* *a* flat, and on page 56 *gander*, page 61, *candor*, *a* short, and *a* is followed by the *same* letters in each case! On page 103, *asperate*, *a* short, and on page 111, *exasperate*, *a* flat! On page 103, *accent*, accented on the *first* syllable, and on page 146, accented on the *last* syllable! On page 129, *rhetoric*, accented on the *second* syllable, page 155, accented on the *first*!

As I intend to point out, at some future time, the contradictions and inconsistencies in the pronunciation and division of words in Mr. Webster's dictionaries, I have, in this review, limited my remarks principally to the contradictions between the Elementary spelling-book and his school dictionary. On page 41, *husbandry*, *s* hissing, like *z* in school dictionary! On page 44, *cartel*, *a* short, *a* flat in dictionary! On page 47, *fault*, page 70, *almanack*, page 83, *default*, *assault*, page 107, *faulty*, *alter*, *almost*, broad *a* short, and broad *a* long in Webster's octavo dictionary! On page 55, *want* broad *a* short, and page 107, *wanting* broad *a* long! page 78, *assure*, page 88, *censure*, *pressure*, *fissure*, without noting the sound of *s* as *sh*, but on page 154, *issue* and *tissue* the sound of *sh* is noted in these two words! &c. &c. &c. page 106, microcosm wrongly pronounced, *i* long in Webster's school dictionary! page 48, *anchovy*, diverse, farewell, page 100, stalactite page 106, *nevertheless* page 115, almost p. 107, whomsoever p. 119, valise p. 154, harangue p. 156, afflux p. 85, wrongly accented! On p. 110, *oblivion*, page 117, *contumelious*, p. 122, *trunnion*, *military*, *modillion*, *rebellion*, *rebellious*, seniority p. 95, cetaceous p. 127, wrong number of syllables! There are in the spelling lessons more than FOUR HUNDRED WORDS which Mr. Ely has divided DIFFERENTLY from Webster's school dictionary! Thus, espouse p. 28, transit, yonder p. 35, armory, victory p. 42, canter, pester, tester, elder, tinder, tiller, tenter p. 43, kernel, garner, fardel p. 44, density, modesty, mountainous p. 48, uneasy, blandish, brandish, furnish, skirmish, varnish page 49, ellipsis, reluctant, important, transcendent, indulgent, effulgent, emulgent, astringent, restringent, emergent, detergent page 102, &c. &c.; and boatswain, p. 74, microscope p. 90, wrongly pronounced, &c.

The *length* of this criticism (not the *want of matter*,) admonishes me that I must draw to a close. This I shall do with the single *remark, that, having pointed out some of the* most prominent DEFICIENCIES, DEFECTS, BLUNDERS, ERROURS, INCON*SISTENCIES, and CONTRADICTIONS* contained in Mr. Webster's Elementary spelling-book, compiled by Aaron Ely, which are *more numerous than in any other spelling-book*, (and I have SIXTY *different* kinds in my possession,) I leave the question, to the people *of the United States to decide*, whether this book shall be patronised and introduced into the schools of this country.

☞ *Please* COMPARE *the* WORDS, *pp.* 9 & 10 of Webster's PAMPHLET, with the following SPECIMENS in ORTHOGRAPHY.

SPECIMENS

OF

WEBSTER'S ORTHOGRAPHY.

[All the words marked with an asterisk, were evidently *copied* from Dilworth's Spelling-Book, as they appeared the same in Dilworth's Spelling-Book, *contrary* to ALL of Webster's Dictionaries, and to the Dictionaries of Johnson and Walker; and they have been thus *contradictory* and *erroneously* spelled in Webster's *old* Spelling-Book for more than forty years !!!]

Old Spelling Book	*Dictionary* 1806.	*Dictionary* 1817.	*Quarto* 1828.	*Octavo* 1831.	*Duodecimo* 1831.	*New Spell. Book.*
	Abatable	Abateable	Abatable	do.	do.	
	Abattis	do.	Abattis and Abatis	Abatis, Abattis	Abattis	
	Abbey or Abby	Abbey	do.	do.	do.	
Abridgement	Abridgment	Abridgement	Abridgment	do.	do.	
Abscision	Abscission	do.	do.	do.	do.	Abscision
	Acanacious		Acanaceous	do.	do.	
	Accepter	do.	Accepter or Acceptor	do.	Accepter	
Accouter	Accouter or Accooter	do.	Accouter	Accoutre, Accouter	Accouter	
			Accoutering	Accoutring	Accoutering	
			Accoutered	Accoutred	Accoutered	
	Accouterments	do.	Accouterments	Accoutrements	Accouterments	do.
Ache	Ache, Ake	do.	do.	do.	do.	Ache
	Aking	do.	Aching, Aking	do.	Aching	
Achievment	Achievement	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Acknowledgment	Acknowledgement	Acknowledgment	do.	do.	do.
Acre	Acre, Aker	do.	do.	do.	do.	Acre
	Addible	do.	do.	Addable, Addible	Addible	
	Admittable	Admitable	Admittable	do.	do.	
	Adventuresome	do.	do.	do.	Adventuresome	
	Aery	do.	Aerie	do.	do.	
	Aggroup	do.	Aggroup, Aggroop	do.	Aggroup	
	Aglet, Aiglet		Aglet, Aiglet, Aiglet	do.	do.	
Aiddecamp	do.	Aidecamp	Aiddecamp	do.	do.	
Ile	Aisle, Aile, Ile	do.	do.	do.	Aisle, Aile	Aisle
			Alchimic	Alchemic	Alchimic	do.
	Alchemical	do.	Alchimical	Alchemical	Alchimical	
			Achimically	Alchemically	Alchimically	
	Alchemist	do.	Alchimist	Alchemist	Alchimist	
		Alchemistic	Alchimistic	Alchemistic	Alchimistic	do.
			Alchimistical	Alchemistical	Alchimistical	
Alchymy	Alchemy	do.	Alchimy	Alchemy	Alchimy	do.
Alcoran	Koran	do.	Alkoran, Koran	do.	do.	Alcoran
	Allege	Alledge	do.	do.	do.	
	Allegeable	Alledgeable	Allegeable	Alledgeable	do.	
	Alleged	Alledged	do.	do.	do.	
			Allegement	Alledgement		
Almanac*	Almanack	do.	do.	Almanac	Almanack	do.
	Ammony	do.	Ammonia, Ammony	do.	do.	
	Amphitheater	do.	do.	Amphitheatre Amphitheater	Amphitheater, or Amphitheatre	
	Anastrophy		Anastrophe, Anastrophy	do.		
	Anemony	do.	Anemone Anemony	do.	do.	
Ancle*	Ankle	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Annotto, arnotto	do.	Anotta	do.		
	Antediluvian	do.	do.	do.	do.	Antedeluvian
	Antistrophy		Antistrophe, Antistrophy	do.	do.	
	Apocopy		Apocope, Apocopy	do.	do.	
	Apophthegm	Apothem	Apophthem, Apothem, Apothegm	do.	Apothem, Apothegm	Apothegm
Apostacy	Apostasy	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
Apostrophe	Apostrophy	do.	Apostrophe, Apostrophy	do.	do.	Apostrophe
	Appellative	do.	do.	do.	do.	Appelative
	Apposit	Apposite	do.	do.	Apposit	Apposite
	Appositly	Appositely	do.	do.	Appositly	
	Appositness	Appositeness	do.	do.	Appositness	
			Archchimic	Archchemic		
	Arquebuse Harquebuse	do.	Arquebuse, Harquebuse	do.	Arquebuse	
	Arrac	do.	Arrack	do.	do.	
	Askance	do.	Askance	do.	do.	
	Askant	do.	Askant	do.	do.	
	Assigner	Assigner, Assignor	do.	do.	do.	
	Assuredly	do.	do.	do.	Asuredly	
	Assurer	do.	do.	do.	Asurer	
	Assuring	do.	do.	do.	Asuring	
	Autocracy	do.	Autocrasy	do.	Autocracy	
Avoirdupois	Avordupois	do.	Avoirdupois	do.	do.	
	Ax	do.	do.	Axe, Ax		
	Ay (yes)	do.	Ay, Aye	do.	do.	
	Baftas		Baffetas, Baftas, Bastas	do.	Baftas	
Bailer	Bailer	do.	Bailer, Bailor	do	do.	
	Bailiff	do.	Bailif (Cor.)	Bailiff, Bailif	Bailif	
Baize	Baize	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Bannerol, Bandroll	do.	Bandrol	do.	do.	
	Bannoc, Jannoc		Bannock	do.	do.	
	Barbacue	do.	Barbecue	do.	do.	Barbacue
Bark	Bark	do.	Bark, Barque	do.	do.	
Bass* (in music)	Base	do.	do.	do.	do.	Base, Bass
	Basevio)	do.	do.	Basevio), Basevio	Basevio	Basevio), Basevio
	Basilisk	do.	do.	do.	do.	Basilisk
	Basin, Bason	do.	Basin	do.	do.	do.

Old Spelling Book	*Dictionary* 1806.	*Dictionary* 1817.	*Quarto* 1828.	*Octavo* 1831.	*Duodecimo* 1821.	*New Spell. Book*
	Bastil		Bastile	do.	do.	
	Bastonade	Bastinade	do.	do.	do	Bastinado
Batteau	Battoe	do.	Bateau	do.	do.	do.
	Battleax	do.	Battleax, Battleaxe	do.	Battleax	
	Bawble	do.	do.	do.	do.	Bauble
Bdellium	do.	do.	do.	do.	Bdellium	Bdellium
	Bedawb	do.	Bedaub	do.	do.	
	Bedcloaths		Bedclothes	do.	do.	
	Bedsted	do.	Bedstead	do.	Bedstead, Bedsted	
Behaviour	Behavior	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
Behoove	Behoove, behove	do.	Behoove	do.	do.	do.
	Behoovful	do.	do.	do.	Behoovful	
	Bellwether	do.	Bellwether	do.	do.	
Belleslettres	do.		do.	do.	Belleslettres	
Bebaub	Benum	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Bergamot, Burgamot	do.	Bergamot	do.	Bergamot, Burgamot	Burgamot
Birth	do.	do.	Berth	do.	do.	
	Betel	do.	Betel, Betle	do.	do.	
		Bezil	Bezel	do.	do.	do.
	Bibacious	Bibaceous	Bibacious	do.	do.	
	Bice	do.	Bice, Bise	do.	do.	
	Bifid	do.	do.	do.	Bifed	
	Billingsgate	do.	do.	do.	Billingsate	
	Bipartible	do.	do.	do.	Bipartable	
	Blackmoore, Blackamoor	Blackamoor	Blackmoor	Blackamoor, Blackmoor	Blackmoor	
	Blameable	Blameable	Blamable	do.	do.	
		Blameableness	Blamableness	do.	do.	
		Blameably	Blamably	do.	do.	
	Blazon	do.	do.	do.	do.	Blazes
	Blessed, Blest	do.	do.	do.	Blessed	Blest
	Bloomary	do.	Blomary	do.	do.	
	Bile (tumor)	Boil	do.	do.	do.	do.
Bonlt*	Bolt	do.	do.	do.	do.	Boult
Bombasin	Bombasine	do.	Bombasin	do.	do.	do.
Boose	do.	do.	Boose, Bouse, Booze	do.	Boose	
						do.
	Boosy	do.	Boosy, Bousy	do	Boosy	
Bourn	Borne	do.	Borne, Bourn	do.	Borne, Bourne	Borne
	Burgeois	do.	Bourgeois, Burgeois	do.	Bourgeois	
Brasier	do.		do.	do.	do.	Brazier
	Brasilwood	do.	Brazilwood	do.	do.	
Breadth	Breadth, bredth	do.	Breadth	do.	do	do.
Brier, Briar	do.	do.	Brier	do.	do.	Brier, Briar
	Bridegroom	do	Bridegoom	Bridegroom	Bridegoom	
	Brimful	Brimfull	Brimful	do.	Brimfull	
Bronze	do.	do.	Bronz, Bronze	do.	Bronze	
	Brunette	Brunett	Brunet, Brunette	Brunette, Brunet	Brunet, Brunette	Brunette
Buccaniar	Buccaneer	Bucanneer	Bucaneer, Bucanier	do.	Bucaneer	do.
Build	do.	do.	Build, Bild	do.	do.	
	Builder	do.	do.	do.	Builder, Bilder	
	Building	do.	do.	do.	Building, Bilding	
Built	do.	do.	do.	do.	Built, bilt	Built
	Bur	do.	do.	do.	do.	Burr
Burthen	Burden	do.	do.	do.	do.	Burthen, Burden
	Burdoc	do.	Burdock	do.	do.	
	Burgh	do.	Burgh, Burg	do.	Burg	
	Burine	do.	Burin	do.	do.	
Burlesque	do.	do.	Burlesque, Burlesk	do.	do.	
	Cacoon	do.	Caccoon			
	Caitiff	do.	Caitif (cor.)	Caitiff, Caitif	Caitif	
Calimanco*	Calamanco	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Calamin		Calamine, Calamin	do.	Calamine	do.
	Calcareous	do.	Calcarious	do.	do.	
Chalice	do.	do.	Calice	do.	Chalice	
Calico	Callico	Calico	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Caliph	do.	Calif	do.	Calif, Caliph	
	Caliphate	do.	Califate, Caliphate, Kalifate	do.	Califate	
	Camellepard		Camelopard	do.		
	Camlet, camblet	do.	Camlet	do.	do.	do.
	Camphire, camphor	do.	Camphor	do.	do.	do.
	Cannil	do.	do.	Canaille	Canail	
	Cancellated	do.	Cancelated	do.	do.	
	Cancellation	do.	Cancelation	do.	do.	
	Cancelled	do.	Canceled	do.	do.	
Cannonier	do.	do.	Cannoneer, Cannonier	do.	Cannonier	do.
	Capillair		Capillaire	do.		
Carbinier	Carbinier, carabinier	do.	Carabineer	do.	Carbinier	do.
Carcass	Carcass	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Carmin	do.	Carmine	do.	Carmin, Carmine	
	Carnellan	do.	do.	do.	do.	Cornelian
Cask	Cask, casque	do.	Cask	do.	do.	Casque
Catastrophe	Catastrophy	do.	Catastrophe, Catastrophy	do.	do.	Catastrophe
	Catcal	do.	Catcall	do.	do.	
	Catsup	do.	Catchup, Catsup	do	do.	
	Caviller	do.	Caviler	do	do.	
	Cazique, cassie	do.	Cazic, Cazique	do.	Cazeke, Cazique	
	Center	do.	do.	Centre, Center	Center	do.
			Centered	Centred	Centered	
			Centering	Centring	Centering	
		Cesarian	Cesarean	do.	Cesarian	
	Chagrined	do.	do	do.	Chagrinned	
Chalibeate	Chalybeate	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
Chameleon	Chameleon	do.	do.	do.	Chamelion	do.
Champaign (wine)	do.	do.	Champagne, Champane	do.	do.	
Champaign (country)	do.	do.	Champaign, Champain	do.	do.	Champaign
	Channelled		Channeled	do.	do.	
Chaces*	Chase	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Chemical	do.	Chimical	Chemical		Chimical
	Chemically	do.	Chimically	Chemically		
Chemist	do.	do.	Chimist	Chemist	Chimist	do.

Old Spelling Book	*Dictionary* 1806.	*Dictionary* 1817.	*Quarto* 1828.	*Octavo* 1831.	*Duodecimo* 1831.	*New Spell. Book*
	Chemistry	do.	Chimistry	Chemistry	Chimistry	do.
	Chesnut	do.	Chestnut	do	do.	do.
Chesnuttree			Chestnuttree	do.	do.	
	Chintz	do.	Chintz	do.	Chintz	Chintz
Chuse, choose	Choose, Chuse	do.	Choose	do.	do.	do.
	Cibol		do.	do.	Cibal	
	Cicatrization	do.	do.	do.	Cicitrization	
	Cicatrize	do.	do.	do.	Cicitrize	
Cimetar	Cimeter, Scimeter	do.	Cimiter, Scimitar	do.	Cimeter	Cimiter
	Clef, Cliff	do.	Clef	do.	do.	
Clench	Clinch	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Clotpoll	do.	do.	do.	Clodpole	
	Clovegilliflower	do.	Clovegillyflower	do.	Clovegilliflower	
Cobler*	Cobbler	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Cockerel	Cockerell	Cockerel	do.	do.	
	Coidle	do.	Codle, Coddle	do.	do.	Coddle
	Cullender	do.	Colander	do.	do	Cullander
Cholic*	Colic	do.	do.	do.	do.	Cholic
	Columbo	do.	Colombo	do.	do.	
Coalter	Colter	do.	do.	do.	Colter, Coulter	Colter
	Comfrey	do.	Comfrey, Comfry, Cumfrey	do.	Comfry	Cumfrey
Commemmoration	Commemoration	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Commixion	do.	Commixation	do.	do.	
	Compartiment	Compartment	do.	do.	do.	
	Composit		Composite	do.		do.
	Concenter	do.	do.	Concentre, Concenter	Concenter	
			Concentered	Concentred	Concentered	
	Concentring	do.	Concentering	Concentring	Concentering	
Connexion	Connection	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Consecrater	do.	Consecrator	do.	do.	
	Consignor	Consignor, Consigner	Consigner, Consignor	do.	do.	
	Contorsion	do.	Contortion, Contorsion	do.	Contortion	do.
Control	do.	do.	Control, Controll	do	Control	do.
	Cony, Coney	do.	do.	do.	Cony	
Coquet	do.	do.	Coquet, Coquette	do	do.	Coquet
	Coralline	Coraline	Coralline	do.	do.	
	Cornice, Cornish	do.	Cornice	do.	do.	
	Cotillion	do.	Cotillon	do.	do.	
	Councillor	do.	Councilor	do.	Counselor	
	Counselled	do.	Counseled	do.	do.	
Counsellor	do.	do.	Counselor	do.	do.	do.
	Courtesan, Courtezan	do.	Courtesan	do.	do.	do.
	Coverlet, coverlid	Coverlet	do.	do.	do.	
Cranch	do.	do.	do.	do.	Cranch, Cranch	Cranch
	Crepuscle	Crepuscule	Crepuscle, Crepuscule	do.	Crepuscle	
Crier	do.	do.	Crier, Cryer	do.	do.	
Croup	Croop	do.	Croop, Croup	Croup, Croop	Croop, Croup	Croup
	Crossexamin	Crossexamine	do.	do.	do.	
Crowd	Crowd, Croud	do.	Crowd	Crowd, Croud	Crowd	
Crumb	Crum	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Cuppel, Cupel		Cupel	do	do.	
	Cuppelation		Cupellation	do.	do.	
	Cursed	do.	do.	do.	do.	Curst.
	Curvilinear	Curvillinear	Curvilinear	do.	do.	
Cutlass	Cutlash, cutlass	Cutlass	Cutlas	do.	do.	do.
	Cyclopedia	do.	Cyclopedia Cyclopede	do.	Cyclopede, Cyclopedia	
	Cyst	do.	do.	do.	do.	Cist
Czar	Czar, Tzar	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Czarina	do.	Tzarina, Czarina	do.	do.	
	Dander, Dandruff	do.	Dandruff	do.	Dandruf	
Daily	Daily, Dayly	do.	do.	do.	Daily	do.
Debonair	do.	do.	Debonnair	do.	do.	Debonair
Definite	Definit	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Delf, Delph	do.	Delf	do.	do.	
	Demarcation	do.	Demarkation	do.	do.	
	Demonical	do.	Demoniacal	do.	do.	
	Dependant	do.	Dependent	do.	do.	
	Depository	do.	Depositary	do.	do.	
			Deputysheriff	Deputysheriff Deputysheriff		
	Dervis, Dervise	do.	Dervis	do.	do.	
	Dishabille	do.	Deshabille, Deshabil, Dishabille, Dishabil	do.	Deshabille, Dishabil	
	Despatch	do.	Dispatch	do.	do.	do.
Determine	Determin	Determine	do.	do.	do.	do.
		Detorsion	do.	do.	Detortion	
	Detracter	do.	Detractor	do.	do.	
	Deuce	Deuse	Duse	do.	do.	
	Develope	do.	Develop	do.	do.	do.
	Developement	do.	Development	do.	do.	
	Dexterous	do.	Dextrous	do.	do.	
	Dexterously	do.	Dextrously	do.	do.	
			Diaresis, Diaresy	Diaeresis, Diereis Diaresy		
Diaphragm	Diaphragm, Diapham	do.	Diaphragm	do.	do.	do.
Dyer*	Dier	do.	Dyer	do.	do.	do.
Dime	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	Dime
	Diocess, Diocese	Diocese	Diocese	Diocese, Diocess	Diocese	do.
Diptheng	do.	do.	Diphthong	do.	do.	do.
	Diphyllous		do.	do.	Diphylous	
	Disk	do.	Disc, Disk	do.	Disk	do.
	Disciplin	Discipline	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Discrepance	do.	Discrepance, Discrepancy	do.		
			do.	do.	Disimbitter	
	Disembitter	do.	Disinthrall	do.	do.	do.
	Disenthrall	do.	do.	do.	do.	Disheveld.
	Dishevel	do.	Dishaveled	do.	do.	do.
	Disheveled	do.	do.	Dissolvable, Dissolvible	Dissolvable	do.
	Dissolvable	do.		do.	do.	do.
	Distil	do.	Distill	do.	do.	
Doctrine	Doctrin	Doctrine	do.	do.		

Old Spelling Book	*Dictionary* 1806.	*Dictionary* 1817.	*Quarto* 1828.	*Octavo* 1831.	*Duodecimo* 1831.	*New Spell. Book*
		Distributor, Distributer	Distributer	do.	Distributor	
	Doggerel	Doggerell	Doggerel	do.	do.	
	Dossel, Dossil	do.	Dossil	do.	do.	do.
Dost, Dots	Dots	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Drachma, Dram	do.	Drachma	Drachma, Dram	do.	Drachma
	Driblet	do.	Dribblet	do.	do.	
			Drillplow	Drillplough	Drillplow	
	Driveller	do.	Driveler	do.	do.	
Drought, Drouth	do.	do.	Drouth	Drought, Drouth	Drouth	do.
Drouthy	Droughty, Drouthy	do.	Drouthy	Droughty, Drouthy	Drouthy	
			Drouthiness	Droughtiness Drouthiness		
	Dueller	do.	Dueler	do.	do.	
	Duellist	do.	Duelist	do.	do.	do.
	Dysoracy		Dyscrasy	do.		
	Eam, Eme		Eame	do.		
	Eclaircissement	do.	do.	do.	Eclaircisment	
Ecstacy	Ecstacy, Ecstacy	Ecstasy	do.	do.	do.	
	Ecstatic	do.	do.	do.	do.	Extatic, Ecstatic
	Embodied	Embodied	Embodied, Imbodied	do.	do.	
	Imbody	do.	Embody, Imbody	do.	do.	
			Embodying, Imbodying	do.	do.	
	Imbolden	do.	Embolden, Imbolden	do.	do.	Emboldon
	Imborder	do.	Emborder, Imborder	do.	do.	
	Imbower	do.	Embower, Imbower	do.	do.	
Impale*	Empale	do.	Empale, Impale	do.	do.	
Impannel	Impannel	do.	Empannel, Impannel	do.	Impannel	do.
	Impark	do.	Empark, Impark	do.	do.	
	Empoison, Impoison	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Empurple, Impurple	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Enamether	do.	Enameler	do.	do.	
	Encage	Encage, Incage	do.	do.	do.	
	Incase	do.	Encase, Incase	do.	do.	
Encumber	Incumber	do.	Encumber, Incumber	do.	do.	Encumber
	Incumbrance	do.	Encumbrance Incumbrance	do.	do.	
	Encyclopedia	do.	Encyclopedia, Encyclopedy	do.	do.	
	Engrain, Ingrain	do.	do.	do.	do.	
			Engrained, Ingrained	do.	do.	
	Ingulf		Engulf, Ingulf	do.	do.	
			Engulfed, Ingulfed	do.	do.	
	Inlist	do.	Enlist, Inlist	do.	do.	
	Inlistment	do.	Enlistment, Inlistment	do.	do.	
Enrol	do.	do.	Enroll	do.	do.	do.
Enrolment	do.	Enrollment	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Enshrine, Inshrine	do.	Enshrine	do.	do.	do.
Enterprise	Enterprise	Enterprise	Enterprise	do.	do.	do.
	Entomb	do.	Entomb, Intomb	do.	Entomb	
Enthral*	Inthrall	do.	do.	do.	do.	Enthrall
	Inthrallment	do.	do.	do.	do.	Enthrallment
	Entrance (s.)	do.	Entranse	Entrance	Entranse	
			Entransed	Entranced	Entransed	
			Entransing	Entrancing	Entransing	
	Intwine	do.	Entwine, Intwine	do.	do.	Entwine
			Entwist, Intwist	do.	do.	
	Envelop	do.	do.	Envelop, Envelope	Envelop	do.
	Envelopement	do.	Envelopment	do.	do.	
Enwrap	Inwrap	do.	do.	do.	do.	
Epaulette	Epaulet	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
Epitome	Epitomy	do.	Epitome, Epitomy	do.	do.	Epitome
	Epitomise	do.	Epitomize	do.	do.	do.
	Epitomiser	do.	Epitomizer	do.	do.	do.
	Ermelin, Ermin	Ermin	Ermin, Ermine	Ermine, Ermis	Ermin, Ermine	Ermin
Etherial	Ethereal	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
			Etherialize	Etherealize		do.
	Exacter	do.	Exactor	do.	Exactor	
Examine	Examin	Examine	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Exorcise	do.	do.	do.	do.	Exorcise
	Exill		Exrill	do.	do.	do.
	Extrafoliaceous		do.	do.	Extrafoliacious	
Faggot*	Fagot	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Fakir		Fakir, Faquir	do.	Faker, Faquir	
	Famine, Famin	do.	Famine	do.	do.	do.
	Farewel	do.	Farewell	do.	do.	do.
	Farinaceous	Farinaceous	Farinaceous	do.	do.	
	Fascine, Fascene		Fascine	do.		Facine
Faucet	Faucet, Fasset	do.	Faucet	do.	do.	
Feather	Feather, Fether	do.	do.	do.	do.	Feather
	Feathery	do.	Feathery, Fethery	Feathery	Feathery, Fethery	
	Featherless	do.	Featherless, Fetherless	Featherless	Featherless, Fetherless	
Felon*	Felon	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Fiber	do.	do.	Fibre, Fiber	Fiber, Fibre	
Finesse	Finess	do.	Finess, Finesse	do.	Finess	
Flagitious	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	Flagicious
	Flammeous		do.	do.	Flameous	
Flaunt	do.	do.	do.	do.	Flaunt, Flaut	Flaunt
Foretell	Foretel	do.	Foretell	do.	do.	do.
Fosse	Foss	do.	do.	Fosse, Foss	Foss	
Fraicheur	Fraicheur		Fraischeur	do.		
Frank	do.	do.	Frank, Franc	do.	Frank	do.
Phrensy*	Frenzy, Phrensy, Phrenzy	Frenzy, Phrensy	do.	do.	Frenzy	do.
	Fricasee	do.	Fricassee	do.	do.	
			Frized	do.	Frizzed	
*Frolic, * Frolick*	*Frolick*	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Fugue	do.	do.	do.	do.	Fugo

Old Spelling Book	*Dictionary* 1806.	*Dictionary* 1817.	*Quarto* 1828.	*Octavo* 1831.	*Duodecimo* 1831.	*New Spell Book*
Fulfil	do.	do.	Fulfill	do.	do.	do.
	Fulfilment	do	Fulfillment	do.	do.	
	Fullness, Fulness	Fullness	do.	do.	do.	
Furlough	do.	do.	Furlow	Furlough, Furlow	Furlow	do.
	Furze	do.	Furz	do.	do.	
	Gamut	do.	Gammut	do.	do.	
Jail	Gaol, Jail	do.	do.	do.	do.	Jail
Gantlet	do.	do.	Gantlope	Gantlope, Gantlet	do.	
Gaunt	do.	do.	Gaunt, Gant	do.	do.	
	Gelatinate	do.	do	do.	Gelatinate	
	Generalissimo	do.	do.	do.	do.	Generalissimo
	Gilliflower	do.	Gillyflower	do.	do.	
	Gillotin	do.	Guillotin	Guillotine	Guillotin	
Gimblet	do.	do.	do.	Gimblet, Gimlet	Gimblet	do.
Gipsy	do.	do.	Gipsey	Gipsy	do.	do.
			Gipseyism	Gipsyism		
	Girasole		Girasol	Girasole, Girasol	Girasol	
	Girroc		Girrook	do.		
Gnoman, Gnomon	Gnomen	do.	Gnomon	do.	do.	do.
	Gordian	do.	do.	do.	do.	Gordon
Goslin	Gosling	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Gospelled	do.			Gospeled	
	Granit	do.	Granit, Granite	Granite, Granit	Granit, Granite	
	Grantor	do.	do.	do.	Granter	
	Graveclothes	do.	Graveclothes	do.		
Gray, Grey*	do.	do.	Gray	do.	do.	do.
	Greyhound	do.	Greyhound, Greyhound	do.	Grayhound	
	Griffin, Griffon	do.	Griffon	do.	do.	Griffin
	Grissamber		Grisamber	do.		
Grotesque	Grotesque, Grotesk	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Groundsel, Grunsel		Groundsel Groundsill	do.		
Group	Group, Groop	do.	do.	do.	Group	
	Groveller	do.	Groveler	do.	do.	
		Grovelling	Groveling	do.	do.	
	Guarantee (*s.*)	do.	Guarantee (*n.*)	do.	Guaranty (*n.*)	
	Guaranty (*n.*)	do.	Guaranty (*v.*)	do.	do.	
	Haggard	do.	Hagard	Haggard, Hagard	Hagard	
	Haggardly	do.	Hagardly	Haggardly	Hagardly	
Haggish	do.	do.	Hagish	do.		Haggish
Heinous	Hainous	do.	do.	Heinous, Hainous	Hainous	do.
	Hainously	do.	do.	Heinously	Hainously	
	Hainousness	do.	do.	Heinousness	Hainousness	
	Holibut	do.	Halibut	do.	do.	do.
Hallee	Halloo	do.	do.	do.	do.	
Handful	Handfull	Handful	do.	do.	do.	do.
Hansel*	Handsel		do.	do.	do.	Hansel, Handsel
	Harpooner	do.	do.	Harpooner, Harponeer	Harpooner	
Hassoe	do.	do.	do.	do.	Hassock	
			Hattock	Hattoc		
	Haulm, Haum	Haum	Haulm, Haum	do.	do.	
Haunch	do.	do.	do.	do.	Hanch, Haunch	Hanch
Haunt	do.	do.	do.	do.	Haunt, Hant	Haunt
Havoc	Havock	Havoc	Havock	Havoc	Havock	
	Hawser		Halser, Hawser	do.	Hawser	
	Hazel	do.	do.	do.	do.	Hazle
	Headach	Headache	Headach	Headache	Headache, Headake	Headache
	Heartach	Heartache	Heartach	Heartache	Heartache, Heartake	Heartache
	Hemlock	do.	do.	Hemloc	Hemlock	do.
	Hickup	do.	Hiccough, Hickup	do.	Hiccough, Hicup	
Highth	do.	do.	Height, Highth, Hight	Height, Hight, Highth	Hight, Highth	Highth, Hight
	Hillock	do.	do.	Hillos	Hillock	do.
Hindrance*	Hinderance	do.	do	do.	do.	
	Holyhock	Hollyhock	do.	do.	do.	do.
Holme	Holm, Holme	do.	Holm	do.	do.	
	Holyday	do.	do.	do.	do.	Holiday
	Homestal		Homestall	do		
	Homested	do.	Homestead	do.	Homested	
	Hoopingcough	do.	do.	do.	do.	Whoopingcough
	Horde	Hord	Hord, Horde	do.	do.	
Huzza	do.	do.	Hoora, Hooraw, Hurraw, Hurrah	do.	Hoora, Hooraw, Hurra, Hurraw	
	Hydrophoby	do.	Hydrophobia, Hydrophoby	do.	Hydrophoby	
	Hydrogene		Hydrogen	do.	do.	
Hyperbole	Hyperbole, Hyperboly	do.	Hyperbole	do.	Hyperbole, Hyperboly	Hyperbole
Hypocrite	Hypocrit	do.	Hypocrite	do.	do.	do.
	Hyssop, Hysop	do.	Hysop, Hyssop	Hyssop, Hysop	Hysop, Hyssop	
Island	Island, Iland, Iland	Island, Island	do.	Island, Iland	Island, Island	Island
	Illumin	do.	Illumine	do.	do.	
Imagine	Imegin	do.	Imagine	do.	do.	do.
	Immoveable	do.	Immovable	do.	do.	
	Immoveably	do.	Immovably	do.	do.	
	Inapposit	do.	Inapposite	do.	do.	
	Incomposit		Incomposite	do.	do.	
	Incontestable, Incontestible	Incontestable	do.	do.	do.	
	Incontestably	do.	Incontestably	do.	do.	
	Indefinit	Indefinite	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Indefinitly	Indefinitely	do.	do.	do.	
	Indocil	do.	Indocile	do.	do.	
	Inoculate	do.	do.	do.	do.	Innoculate
Ensnare	Insnare	do.	do.	do.	do.	Ensnare, Insnare
Instead	Instead, Insted	do.	Instead	do.	do.	
Instil	do.	do.	Instill	do.	do.	do.
Instructor	Instructer, Instructor	Instructor	do.	do.	do.	
	Instrumentality	do.	do.	do.	Instrumentality	Instrumentality
	Inwreathe	do.	do.	do.	Inwreath	
	Irreconcileable	do.	Irreconcilable	do.	do.	
	Irremoveable	Irremovable	do.	do.	do.	
	Irremoveability	do.	Irremovability	do.	do.	
	Isinglass	do.	Isinglass	do.	Isinglass	do.
Isthmus	*Isthmus, Istmus*	do.	Isthmus	do.	do.	
Jaunt	do.	do.	Jaunt	do		

Old Spelling Book	*Dictionary* 1806.	*Dictionary* 1817.	*Quarto* 1828.	*Octavo* 1831.	*Duodecimo* 1831.	*New Spell. Book.*
	Jasmin	do.	Jasmin, Jasmine	do.	do.	Jasmin
Jessamine	Jessamin	do.	do.	do.		
Jeweller	do.	do.	Jeweler	do.	do.	
Jewelry	Jewellery	Jewelry	do.	do.	do.	
Jocky*	Jockey	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Jole, Jowl	do.	do.	Jole, Joll, Jowl	Jole	
Judgement	do.	do.	Judgment	do.	do.	
Julep*	Julap, Julep	do.	Julep	do.	do.	
			Kale	do.	do.	Cale
Lacquey	Lackey	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Lampers	do.	Lampas	do.	do.	
Launch	Lanch	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
Laste	Last	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Laundress Landress	do.	Laundress	do.	Laundress, Landress	
	Lausdry	Lausray	Laundry	do.	Laundry, Landry	
	Laurelled	Laureled	do.	do.	do.	
	Laureate	do.	do.	do.	do.	Laureat
Leather	Lether	do.	Leather, Lether	do.	do.	Leather
	Leathern	do.	Leathern, Lethern	Leathern	do.	do.
	Leathery	do.	Leathery, Lethery	Leathery	do.	
	Ledger	do.	Leger, Ledger	do.	Leger	Ledger
	Letlice, Lettuce	do.	Lettuce	do.	do.	
	Leveller	do.	Leveler	do.	do.	
	Libellant	do.	Libelant	do.	do.	
	Libeller	do.	Libeler	do.	do.	
	Libellous	do.	Libelous	do.	do.	
Libertine	Libertin	do.	Libertine	do.	do.	do.
	Licence, License	License	do.	do.	do.	
	Lillied	do.	Lilied	do.	do.	
	Lily	do.	do.	do.	do.	Lilly
Liver	do.	do.	Livre	do.		
	Loadstone, Lodestone	Loadstone	Lodestone	do.	do.	
Loth	Loath, Loth	do.	do.	do.	Loth	do.
Loathe	Loathe, Lothe	Loathe	Loathe, Lothe	do.	Lothe	
	Loathful	do.	Loathful, Lothful	do.	Lothful	
	Loathing	do.	Loathing, Lothing	do.	Lothing	
	Loathly	do.	Loathly, Lothly	do.	Lothly	
	Loathness	do.	Loathness, Lothness	do.	Lothness	
Loathsome	do.	do.	Loathsome, Lothsome	do.	Lothsome	
	Loathsomeness	do.	Loathsomeness, Lothsomeness	do.	Lothsomeness	
	Lodgement	do.	Lodgment	do.	do.	
Loch	Loch, Lough	do.	do.	do.	do.	Loch
	Lunett	do.	Lunet, Lunette	do.	do.	
Luster	do.	do.	do.	Lustre, Luster	Luster, Lustre	
	Lustring, Lutestring	do.	Lustring	do.	do.	
Mackerel	Mackarel	do.	Mackerel	do.	do.	do.
Maize, Mais	Maiz	do.	do.	Maize, Maiz	Maiz	do.
Malecontent	Malcontent	do.	do.	do.	do.	
Maneuver, (n.)	do.	do.	do.	Manoeuvre, Maneuver (n.)	Maneuver	do.
	Maneuver, (v.)	do.	do.	Manoeuvre (v.)	Maneuver	do.
			Maneuvered	Manoeuvred	Maneuvered	
			Maneuvering	Manoeuvring	Maneuvering	
	Marcescent	do	do.	do.	Marcescent	
	Marcschal	do.	do.	do.	Marechal	
	Marlin	do.	Marline	do.	do.	do.
	Marque		Marque, Mark	do.	Mark, Marque	
	Marshaller	do.	Marshaler	do.	do.	
	Marvellous	do.	Marvelous	do.	do.	do.
	Marvellously	do.	Marvelously	do.	do.	
Mask	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	Masque
Massacre	do.	do.	Massacer, Massacre	Massacre, Massacer	Massacre	
	Mastick	Mastic	Mastic, Mastich	do.	Mastich	do.
Mastiff	do.	do.	Mastif (cor.)	Mastiff, Mastif	Mastif, Mastiff	
	Mattock	do.	do.	Mattoc	Mattock	do.
Maul	Mall, Maul	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
Meadow	Meadow, Medlow	Meadow	do.	do.	do.	do.
Meathe	Meathe		do.	do.		Meath
	Medallist	Medalist	Medallist	do.	Medalist	
Medicine	Medicin	Medicine	do.	do.	do.	
Molasses	Melasses	do.	do.	Melasses, Melasses	Melasses	do.
	Mellifluent	do.	do.	do.	do.	Mellifluent
	Mellifluous	do.	do.	do.	do.	Mellifluous
	Merchandise	do.	Merchandise	do.	do.	do.
	Metallisation		Metallization	do.	do.	
Meter	do.	do.	do.	Metre, Meter	Meter	
Methodize	Methodise	do.	Methodize	do.	do.	do
	Middling	do.	do.	do.	do.	Midling
	Midriff	do.	do.	do.	Midrif	
Mien	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	Mein, Mien
	Millenial	Millennial	Millenial	do.	do.	Millennial
Millennium	do.	do.	Millenium	do.	do.	Millennium
	Mimic, (n.)	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Mimic, (v.)	do.	Mimick, (v.)	do.	do.	
	Minstrelsey	do.	Minstrelsy	do.	do.	
			Mispikel	do.	Mispickel	
	Misprise		Misprise, Misprize	do.	Misprise	
		Mispell	Mispell	do.	do.	
	Mispend	do.	Mispend	do.	do.	
	Mispense	do.	Mispense	do.	do.	
Miter	do.	do.	do.	Mitre, Miter	Miter, Mitre	
	Mitered	do.	do.	Mitred	Mitered	
	Mizen	do.	Mizzen	do.	do.	
	Moccason, Moggasson	do.	Moccason	do.	do.	
	Modeller	do.	Modeler	do.	do.	
Moult	Molt	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Monarchies		Monarchize	do.	do.	
	Mopey		Mopsey	do.	do.	
		Moresk	Moresk, Moresque	do.	do.	
	Morris		Morris, Morrice	do.	Morris	
	Moskatel		Moschatel	do.	do.	
Mosque*	Mosk, Mosque	do.	Mosk	Mosk, Mosque	Mosk	Mosque
	Movable	do.	Movable	do.	do.	do.
	Muscadin	do.	Muscadine	do.	do.	

Old Spelling Book	*Dictionary* 1806.	*Dictionary* 1817.	*Quarto* 1828.	*Octavo* 1831.	*Duodecimo* 1881.	*New Spell Book.*
Musketoe	do.	do.	do.	Musketoe, Musquetoe	Musketoe	
	Nectarin	do.	Nectarine	do.	do.	
Negociate	Negotiate, Negociate	Negotiate	do.	do.	do.	do.
Neighbor	do.	do.	Neighbor, Nehboor	do.	do.	Neighbor
	Net	Nett, Neat	Net	do.	do.	Nett
Niche	Nich	do.	Nich, Niche	Niche, Nich	Nich, Niche	
	Nightmare	do	Nightmar	Nightmare, Nightmar	Nightmar	do.
Niter	do.	do.	do.	Nitre, Niter	Niter, Nitre	
Noggen	Noggin	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
Nought	Naught, Nought	do.	Naught	do.	do.	Nought
Noviciate	Novitiate	do.	do.	do.	do.	Noviciate
	Noyeau	do.	Noyau	do.	do.	
	Oblique	Oblique, Oblike	do.	do.	do.	Oblique
	Obliquely	do.		do.	Obliquely, Oblikely	
	Obliqueness	do.		do.	Obliqueness, Oblikeness	
Ocher	do.	Ocher, Oker	Ocher	Ocire, Ocher	Ocher, Ochre	Ocher
	Ocherous	do.	do.	Ochreous	Ocherous	
	Ochery	do.	Ochrey	do.	Ochery	
Offence*	Offense	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Omber	do.	Omber, Ombre	Ombre, Omber	Omber, Ombre	
Omniginous	Omnigenous	do.	do.	do.		
Ouse, Ooze	Ooze	do.	Ooze, Ouse	do.	Ooze	Ooze, Ouse, Oose !!
Opake	do.	do.	do.	Opaque, Opake	Opake	Opaque, Opake
	Opakeness	do.	do.	Opaqueness	Opakeness	
Opposite	Opposit	Opposite	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Oppositly	do.	Oppositely	do.	do.	
Orchester	do.	do.	do.	Orchestre, Orchester	Orchester	do.
Osier	Osier, Ozier	do.	Osier	do.	do.	do.
	Oxygene	do.	Oxygen	do.	do.	
	Oyes	do.	do.	do.	Oyez	
	Pailful	do.	Pailful	Pailful	do.	
	Palanquin, Palankin	do.	Palankeen, Palanquin	Palanquin, Palankeen	Palankeen, Palanquin	
	Palet	do.	Pallet	do.	do	
	Paralize	do.	do.	Paralize, Paralyze	Paralyze	
	Paregoric	do.	do.	do.	do.	Paragoric
Parishioner	Parishoner	do.	Parishioner	do.	do.	do.
	Parole	do.	Parol, Parole	do.	do.	
	Paroket	do.	Paroquet, Paroket, Perroquet	do.	Paroket, Paroquet, Perroquet	
Paroxism	Paroxysm	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Parsnip	do.	Parsnep	do.	do.	do.
	Patrol	do.	Patrol, Patroll	do.	do.	Patrol
	Patronise	do.	Patronize	do.	do.	do.
	Paver	do.	Paver, Pavier	do.	Paver	
Payor	Payer	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Pedlar, Pedler	Pedler	do.	do.	Peddler	do.
	Pedlery	do.	do.	do.	Peddlery	
	Pedling	do.	Peddling	do.	do.	
	Pencilled		Pencilled	do.	do.	
Perquisite	Perquisit	Perquisite	do.	do.	do.	
	Pharmacopeia		Peter, Petre Pharmacopaeia, Pharmacopy	Petre, Peter do.		
	Philippic	Phillipic	Philippic	do.	do.	
	Phleme	do.	Fleam	do.	do.	Phleme
	Pickax	do.	do.	Pickaxe	Pickax	
	Picturesque	Picturesque, Picturesk	do.	do.	Picturesk, Picturesque	
Pinchers	do.	do.	do.	Pincers, Pinchers	Pinchers	do.
	Pitfal	Pitfall	do.	do.	do.	
	Plaintiff	do.	Plaintif	Plaintiff, Plaintif	Plaintif	
Plow	do.	do.	do.	Plough, Plow	Plow	do.
			Plowalms	Ploughalms		
			Plowbote	Ploughbote		
	Plowboy		do.	Ploughboy		
			Plowed	Ploughed	Plowed	do.
			Plower	Plougher		
			Plowing	Ploughing	Plowing	
	Plowland	do.	do.	Ploughland	Plowland	
	Plowman	do.	do.	Ploughman	Plowman	
			Plowmonday	Ploughmonday		
	Plowshare	do.	do.	Ploughshare	Plowshare	
	Plumcake	do.	do.	do.	Plumbcake	
Pneumatics	do.	Pnumatics	Pneumatics	do.	do.	do.
Poise*	Poize, Poise	do.	Poise	do.	do.	do.
	Poltroon	do.	do.	do.	do.	Paltroon
	Pumice	do.	Pomace	do.	do	
	Pumkin	Pumpkin	Pompion, Pumpion, Pumpkin	do.	Pompion, Pumpkin	Pompion
	Pontiff	do.	Pontif	Pontiff, Pontif	Pontif	
	Porpess	do.	do.	Porpoise, Porpus, Porpess	Porpess	do.
	Portress	do.	Portress, Porteress	do.	Porteress	
Postillion	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	Postilion
Potatoe	do.	do.	Potato	do.	Potatoe	do.
	Powow	do.			Powwow	
	Prairy	do.	do.	Prairie, Prairy	Prairy	
	Probat, Probate	Probate	do.	do.	do.	
	Proceed	do.	Proceed, Procede	do.	Proceed	
	Prophesy (n.)	Prophecy	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Prosopopy		Prosopopeia, Prosopopy	do.	Prosopopy	
	Proveable	do.	Provable	do.	do.	do.
Punctillio	Punctilio	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Purr	do.	Pur, Purr	do.	Pur	Purr
Quadrille	Quadril	do.	Quadrille	do.	do.	
Quarantine	Quarantin	do.	Quarantine	do.	do.	
Coif, Quoif	do.	do.	Coif	do.	do.	Quoif, Coif
	Raccoon	do.	Racoon	do.	Raccoon	do.
	Raddish	do.	Radish	do.	do.	Raddish
Rallery	Raillery, Rallery	Rallery, Rallery	Raillery	Raillery, Rallery	Raillery, Rallery	
	Raindeer, Reindeer	do.	Raindeer, Raneder, Reindeer	do.	do.	
	Ransomless	do.	do.	do.	Ransomless	
Rateable	do.	Rateable	Ratable	do.	do.	
	Ravin	Ravine	Ravin, Ravine	do.	do	

Old Spelling Book	*Dictionary* 1806.	*Dictionary* 1817.	*Quarto* 1828.	*Octavo* 1831.	*Duodecimo* 1834.	*New Spell. Book*
Receipt	do.	do.	Receipt, Receit	do.	do.	Receipt
Recision	Recision, Rercision		do.	do.	do.	Recision
Recompence	Recompense	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Reconcilable	do	Reconcilable	do.	do.	
	Reconcilableness	do.	Reconcilableness	do.	do.	
	Redout	Redoubt	Redout	Redoubt, Redout	Redout	do.
	Redoutable	Redoubtable	Redoutable	Redoubtable, Redoutable	Redoutable	
	Reexamin	Reexamine	do.	do.	do.	
Referable	Referable, Referrible	Referable	Referable, Referrible	do.	Referable	
Reenforce	do.	do.	Reenforce, Reinforce	do.	do.	
	Reenforcement	do.	Reenforcement, Reinforcement	do.	do.	Reenforcement
Requisite	Requisit	Requisite	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Requisitly	Requisitely	do.	do.	do.	
	Requisitness	Requisiteness	do.	do.	do.	
	Restif, Restive	do.	Restif	Restiff, Restif	Restif, Restive	
	Restiveness	do.	Restiveness	Restiffness	Restiffness	
			Reveille, Revelly	do.	Revelly	
	Reveller	do.	Reveler	Reveller	Reveler	
	Reverie, Revery	do.	Revery	Revery, Reverie	Revery	do.
	Ribbon, Riband	Riband	Ribin	Ribbon, Ribin	Ribin	do.
Rince, Rinse	Rinse	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Rondeau		Rondeau, Rondo	do.	Rondeau	do.
Roquelaur	Roquelaure, Roquelo		Roquelaur	do.	do.	
	Route (way)	do.	Rout	Rout, Route	Rout	Route, Rout (way)
	Rudd		Rud, Rudd	do.	Rudd	Rud
Rout	Runt	do.	do	do.	do.	do.
	Saber	do.	Saber, Sabre	Sabre, Saber	Saber, Sabre	
Satchel*	Sachel, Satchel	Sachel	do.	do.	do.	Satchel
Sadler*	Saddler	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Sailer, Sailor	do.	Sailor, Sailer	do.	Sailor	
Saleable	do.	do.	Salable	do.	do.	do.
	Saleableness	do.	Salableness	do.	do.	
Sallad*	Salad	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Salep, Saloop	do.	Salep	do.	Salep, Salop	
	Saltpeter	do.	Saltpeter, Saltpetre	Saltpetre, Saltpeter	Saltpeter, Saltpetre	
	Scald	do.	do.	do.	do.	Scall
Scepter	do.	do.	do.	Sceptre, Scepter	Scepter	
	Sceptered	do.	do.	Sceptred	Sceptered	
Schirrous	do.	Skirrous	Scirrous, Scirrus, Skirrus,	do.	Scirrous, Scirrus	Scirrous
Scissors	Scissars, Scissors	Scissors	do.	do.	do.	do.
Scout	Scot	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Seabord	Seaboard	do.	do.	Seabord	
	Seapye	do.	Seaple	do.	do.	
Seathe*	Seath	do.	Seathe	do.	do.	
Seignior, Seignor*	Seignior	do.	do.	do.	do.	Seignor, Seignior
	Seine	do.	Sein	do.	do.	Seine
	Selvage	do.	Selvedge	do.	do.	
	Semiopaque		do.	Semiopaque		
	Senna, Senna	Senna	do.	do.	do.	
Sevennight	Sevennight, Sennight	do.	Sennight, Sevennight	Sevennight, Sennight	Sennight	
Sepulcher	do.	Sepulchre	Sepulcher (n.)	Sepulchre, Sepulcher (n.)	Sepulcher (n. & v.)	do.
			Sepulcher (v.)	Sepulchre (v.)		
Serjeant*	Sergeant	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Sew, Sue	do.	Sew	do.	do.	
	Shalote	do.	do.	do.	Shallote	
Chamois	Chamois, Shamois		Chamois, Shamois, Shammy	do.	do.	
	Sheath, Sheathe (v.)	do.	do.	do.	do.	Sheathe
	Sheriff	do.	Sherif	Sheriff, Sherif	Sherif	
	Sheriffalty		Sherifalty	Sheriffalty		
	Sheriffdom	do.	Sherifdom	Sheriffdom		
			Sherifship	Sheriffship		
			Sherifwick	Sheriffwick		
Shew*	Show	do.	do.	do.	do.	Shew
Shoar* (a prop)	Shore	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Showbread	do.	Showbread, Shewbread	do.	do.	
Shroud	Shroud, Shrowd	do.	Shroud	do.	do.	do.
	Shily	do.	Shyly	do.	do.	
	Shiness	do.	Slyness	do.	do.	
	Sibylline		do.	Sibilline		
	Sirius	Sirious	Sirius	do.	do.	do.
Sythe	do.	Sithe	Sythe	do.	do.	do.
	Sizeable	do.	Sizable	do.	do.	
Skein	Skain, Skein	do.	Skain	do.	do.	do.
	Skilful	do.	Skillful	do.	do.	do.
	Skilfully	do.	Skillfully	do.	do.	
	Skilfulness	do.	Skillfulness	do.	do.	
	Slay, Slaie	do.	Slaie, Sley	do.		
	Sley	do.	Sleigh	do.	do.	do.
Sluice	Sluice, Sluce	Sluce, Sluice	Sluice, Sluse	do.	do	
	Sluicy		Sluicy, Sluey	do.		
	Slyly, Silly		Silly	do.	Slyly	
	Sliness	do.	do.	do.	Slyness	
	Sodder, Solder	do.	Soder	do.	do.	
	Solitaire	do.	Solitair	Solitaire	Solitair	
	Somber	do.	Somber, Sombre	Sombre, Somber	Somber, Sombre	
	Soshong, Souchong	do.	Soosshong, Souchong	do.	Souchong	
Soup	Soup, Soop	do	Soup	do.	do.	
Sovereign	do.	do.	Suveran, Sovereign (a.)	Sovereign, Suveran	do.	Sovereign
			Suveran, Sovereign (n.)	Sovereign	Sovereign, Suveran	
	Sovreignty	do.	Suveranty, Sovereignty	Sovereignty	Sovereignty, Suveranty	
			Suveranly, Sovereignly	Sovereignly		
Specter	do.	do.	do.	Spectre, Specter	Specter, Spectre	
	Spignel		Spicknel, Spignel	do.	do.	
Spinet	Spinnet	do.	Spinet	do.	do.	
Spirt	*Spirt, Spurt*	*do.*	Spurt	do.	do.	do.
Splice	*do.*	*do.*	Splice, Splise	do.	Splise, Spliced	Splice

Old Spelling Book	*Dictionary* 1806.	*Dictionary* 1817.	*Quarto* 1828.	*Octavo* 1831.	*Duodecimo* 1833.	*New Spell. Bk.*
Sponge	Spunge	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
Spread	do.	do.	Spread, Spred	do.	do.	Spread
			Spreading, Spredding	Spreading	Spreading, Spredding	
			Spreader, Spredder	Spreader	Spreader, Spredder	
	Spright, Sprite	do.	do.	do.	Sprite	do.
Staunch	Stauch	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
Steed	Stead, Sted	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Steadfast, Stedfast	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Steadfastly, Stedfastly	Steadfastly	Steadfastly, Stedfastly	Steadfastly	Steadfastly, Stedfastly	
	Steadfastness, Stedfastness	Steadfastness	Steadfastness, Stedfastness	Steadfastness	Steadfastness, Stedfastness	
	Steadily, Steddily		do.	Steadily	Steadily, Steddily	
	Steadiness, Steddiness		do.	Steadiness	Steadiness, Steddiness	
	Steady, Steddy	Steady	Steady, Steddy	do.	do.	
Stealth	Stealth, Stelth	do.	Stealth	do.	Stealth, Stelth	Stealth
	Steril	do.	Steril, Sterile	Sterile, Steril	Steril, Sterile	Steril
Streight, Stralt	Strait	do.	Straight	do.	do.	
Stupify	Stupify, Stupefy	Stupify	Stupefy	do.	do.	
Subtract*	Substract	do.	Subtract, Substract	do.	do.	Subtract
	Substraction	do.	Subtraction, Substraction	do.	do.	Subtraction
	Subtile	do.	Subtil	Subtil, Subtile	Subtil	do.
	Subtileness	do.	Subtilness	do.	do.	
Subtle	do.	do.	do.	do.	Subtil	do.
	Succeed	do.	Succede, Succeed	Succeed, Succede	Succeed	
Suitor	Suiter, Suitor	do.	Suitor	do.	do.	
	Superintendant	do.	Superintendent	do.	do.	
	Surprise, Surprize	Surprise	do.	do.	do.	
Survivor	Surviver, Survivor	Survivor	Surviver, Survivor	do.	Survivor	
Swap	Swap, Swop	do.	do.	do.	Swap	Swop, Swag
Swash	Swosh	do.	Swash	do.	do.	
	Sweethriar	Sweethriar	Sweethriar	do.	Sweethrier	
Sword	do.	do.	do.	do.	Sword, Sord	
	Silvan, Sylvan		do.	do.	Silvan	Sylvan
Syncope	do.		Syncope, Syncopy	do.	do.	Syncope
Synecdoche	do.		Synecdoche, Synecdochy	do.	do.	
	Taborin	do.	Taborin, Taborine	Taborine, Taborin	Taborin	
	Taffeta, Taffety	do.	Taffeta	do.	do.	
Tailor	Tailor, Taylor	do.	Tailor	do.	do.	
	Talc, Talck	do.	Talck, Talc	Talc, Talck	Talck	
	Tallage, Tallage	Tallage	Tallage, Talliage	do.	Tallage	
Tameable	do.	do.	Tameable	do.	do.	
	Tambour	do.	Tambor	do.	do.	
	Tamborin	do.	do.	Tamborine, Tamborin	Tamberin	
	Tarif, Tariff	do.	Tarif	Tariff, Tarif	Tarif	
	Tarpawling		Tarpaulin	do.		
	Tarras, Terras		Tarrace, Tarrass, Terrass, Trass	do.		
Tastable	do.	Tasteable	Tastable	do.	do.	
Tatler*	Tattler	do.	do.	do.	do.	
Tease	Tease, Tease	Tease	do.	do.	do.	
Teint	Tint	do.	Teint, Tint	do.	Tint	do.
Tether	Tedder	do.	do.	do.	do.	Tether
Tenon	do.	Tennon	Tenon	do.	do.	do.
Tierce	Terce	Tierce	Terce, Tierce	do.	do.	
Theater	do.	do.	Theater, Theatre	Theatre, Theater	Theater, Theatre	
	Thickscull	do.	Thickskull	do.	do.	
Thowl	Thole	do.	do.	do.	do.	Thowl
Though	Tho, Though	do.	Though	do.	do.	do.
	Thraldom	do.	Thralldom	do.	do.	do.
Thrash	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	Thresh, Thrash
Thread	Thread, Thred	do.	do.	do.	Thread	do.
Threat	Threat, Thret	do.	Threat	do.	do.	do.
	Threatening	do.	do.	do.	do.	Threatning
	Threshold	do.	Threshhold	Threshold, Threshhold	Threshhold	
Thumb	Thum (*n.*)	Thumb	Thumb, Thum	do.	Thumb	do.
	Thum (*v.*)	do.	Thumb, Thum	Thumb	do.	
	Thumband		Thumbband, Thumband	Thumbband		
			Thumbed, Thummed	Thumbed		
			Thumring	Thumbring		
	Thumstal		Thumstall	Thumbstall		
Thwak	Thwack	do.	do.	do.	do.	do
	Tie	do.	Tie, Tye	do.	do.	
Tiplar	Tippler	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Tithable, Titheable	Titheable	Tithable	do.	do.	do.
Ton	Tun	do.	do.	do.	do.	Ton
Tongue	Tongue, Tung	do.	do.	do.	do.	Tongue
	Toothach	do.	Toothache	do.	do.	do.
Tour	Tour, Toor	do.	Tour	do.	do.	
	Tranquillise	do.	Tranquilise	do.	do.	do.
	Transferrable	do.	Transferable	do.	do.	
	Traveller	do.	Traveler	do.	do.	
Tread	Tread, Tred	do.	Tread	do.	do.	do.
	Treadle, Treddle	do.	do.	do.	do.	Treadle
	Trefoil	do.	do.	do.	Treefoil	Trefoil
			Trenchplow	Trenchplough	Trenchplow	
			Trenchplowing	Trenchpleughing	Trenchplowing	
	Trevet, Trivet	do.	Trevet	do.	Trevet, Trivet	
	Tripinnate		Tripennate, Tripinnate	do.	do.	
Tripthong	do.	do	Triphthong	do.	do.	do.
Trisyllable	Trisyllable	do.	do.	do.	do.	Trisyllable
Turky	do.	do.	Turkey, Turky	do.	do.	
	Turnip	do.	Turnep	do.	do.	
Tush	Tush, Tusk	Tusk	Tush, Tusk	do.	Tusk	do.
	Turkois, Turcois		Turkois	do.		Turquois
Tweag	Tweag, Tweak	do.	do.	do.	do.	Tweak
Twiggin	Twiggen	do.	do.	do.	do.	Twiggin
			Unaking	Unaching		
	Unapparelled	do.	Unanalysed	Unanalysed	do.	
	Unblamable	Unblameable	Unapparelled	do.	do.	
	Unbuild	do.	Unblamable	do.	do.	
	Unbuilt	do.	Unbuild, Unbild	do.	Unbuilt, Unbild	
			Unbuilt, Unbilt	Unbuilt		

Old Spelling Book	*Dictionary* 1806.	*Dictionary* 1817.	*Quarto* 1828.	*Octavo* 1831.	*Duodecimo* 1831.	*New Spell. Book*
	Unbarnt	do.	Unburned, Unburnt	do.	do.	
	Unburthen	do.	Unburthen, Unburden	do.	do.	
	Uncancelled	do.	Uncanceled	do.	do.	
	Unclench	do.	do.	Unclinch	do.	
			Unconscienous	Unconscientious	do.	
	Undersheriff	do.	Undersheriff	Undersheriff	Undersheriff	
			Undershrifry	Undersheriffry		
	Unencumbered, Encumbered	do.	do.	do.	Unencumbered	
	Unenchanted	do.	Unenchanted, Uninchanted	do.	Unenchanted	
	Unenterprizing	do.	Unenterprising	do.	do.	
	Unequalled	do	Unequaled	do.	do.	
	Unlevelled	do.	Unleveled	do.	do.	
	Unmoveable	do.	Unmoveable	do.	do.	
	Unpatronised	do.	Unpatronized	do.	do.	
	Unpierced	do.	do.	do.	Unpierced, Unpierced	
	Unplowed	do.	(not *plowed*)	Unplaughed (not *plaughed*)	Unplowed	
	Unreconcileable	do.	Unreconcilable	do.	do.	
	Unrivalled	do.	Unrivaled	do.	do.	
	Unroll	do	Unroll	do	do.	
	Unsaleable	do.	Unsalable	do.	do.	
	Unshakeable		Unshakable	do.		
	Unshoeable		Unshoeable	do.		
	Unskilful	do.	Unskillful	do	do	do.
	Unskilfully	do.	Unskillfully	do.	do.	
	Unskilfulness	do.	Unskillfulness	do.	do.	
		Unsoder			Unsoder	
	Unstanched, Unstanched	Unstanched	do.	do.	do.	
	Unsteadfast, Unsteadfast	do.	Unsteadfast	do.	Unsteadfast Unsteadfast	
	Unsteadiness, Unsteadiness	do.	Unsteadiness	do.	Unsteadiness, Unsteadiness	
	Unsteady, Unsteady	do.	Unsteady	do.	Unsteady, Unsteady	
	Untameable	do.	Untamable	do.	do.	
	Unty, Unty	Untie	do.	do.	Untie, Untye	
	Untuel	do.	do.	do.	Untuel, Untyed	
	Untransferrable	do.	Untransferable	do.	do.	
	Untravelled	do.	Untraveled	do.	do.	
	Unworshipped	do.	Unworshiped	do.	do.	
	Valetudinarian	do.	do.	do.	do.	Valetudenarian
Vaunt	Vaunt, Vant	do.	Vaunt	do.	Vaunt, Vant	Vaunt
	Vaunter	do.	do.	do.	Vaunter, Vanter	
	Vaunting	do	do.	do.	Vaunting, Vanting	
	Vauntingly	do.	do.	do.	Vauntingly, Vantingly	
	Ventilate	do.	do.	do.	do.	Ventiliate
Vergnloo	Vergoloo	do.	Vergonleuse	do.	Vergonlous	
Verjuice	Verjuice	do.	Verjuice	do	do.	
Virge, Verge	do.	Verge	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Verteber		do.	Vertebry, Verteber		
Vise*	Vice	do.	Vise	do.	do.	do.
	Victualler	do.	Victualer	do.	do.	
	Vignet	do.	Vignette, Vignet	do.	Vignet, Vignette	
	Villanize	do.	do.	do.	Villanize	
	Villanage	do.	do.	do.	Villainage	
	Villain	do.	Villain, Villan	do.	Villain	do.
	Villanous	do	Villanous, Villainous	do.	Villainous	do.
	Villanously	do.	do.	do.	Villainously	
Villany	do.	do.	Villany, Villainy	do.	Villany	do.
Vineyard	Vineyard, Vinyard	do.	do.	do.	do.	Vineyard
	Visiter, Visitor	do.	Visitor	do.	do.	
	Vollied	do.	Volleyed	do.	do.	
Vulture	Vultur	do.	Vultur, Vulture	Vulture, Vultur	Vultur, Vulture	
	Waggon	do.	Wagon	do.	do.	do.
Waggoner	do.	do.	Wagoner	do.	do.	
	Waggoning	do.	Wagoning	do.	do.	
	Wannish	do.	do.	do.	Wanish	do.
	Wawl	do.	Waul	Waul, Wawl	Waul	do.
Wealth	Wealth, Welth	do.	Wealth	do.	do.	
	Weasand, Weazon	Weazon	Weasand, Weasand	do.	do.	do.
	Weasel	do.	Weasel, Weasel	do.	Weasel	
Weather	Weather, Wether	do.	Weather	do.	do.	do.
	Whiggism	do.	do.	do.	do.	Whigism
	Whippowill	do.	Whippowil	do.	do.	
Whurr	Whur, Whurr	Whur	do.	do.	do.	
	Wiery	do.	Wiery, Wiry	do.	do.	
Wilful	do.	do.	Willful	do.	do.	
	Wilfully	do.	Willfully	do.	do.	
	Wilfulness	do.	Willfulness	do.	do.	
Wince	Wince, Winch	do.	do.	do.	do.	
	Windful	do.	Windfull	do.	do.	
	Windlass	Windlass	Windlass, Windlass	do.	do.	
	Winterly, Wintry	Wintry	Wintery	do.	do.	Wintry
	Withal	do.	do.	do.	Withall	do.
Withe	do.	do.	With, Withe	do.	Withe, With	Withe
Wo, Woe	Woe, Wo	do.	Wo	Woe, Wo	Woe	
	Wolverene	do.	Wolverin, Wolverene	do.	Wolverin	do.
Women	Wimmen	do.	Women	do.	do.	do.
	Wonderous, Wondrous	do.	Wondrous	do.	do.	
	Woodchuck	do.	Woodchuk	do.	do.	
Woollen	do.	Woolen	do.	do.	do.	
	Woolliness	Woolliness	do.	do.	do.	
	Worshipper	do.	Worshiper	do.	do.	
	Wot	do.	do.	do.	do.	Wat, Wot
Wreath	Wreath, Wreathe	Wreath	do.	do.	do.	do.
	Wreckfull		Wreckful	do.	do.	
	Wren	do.	do.	do.	do	Ren
Yeast	*Yeast, Yest*	do.	Yeast	do.	do.	do.
Yearn	*do.*	do.	Yearn, Yern	do.	Yearn	do.
	Yelk, Yolk	do.	Yelk	do.	do	do.
	Zebra, Zebra	Zebra	do.	do.	do.	
	Zink, Zinc	do.	Zink	Zinc, Zink	Zink	

MAY 29 1959

MAY 29 1959